590

CHILLINGWORTH's *Safe Way*, p. 180.

WHen we ſhall come to the Queſtion of Schiſm, I perſuade my ſelf, that I ſhall plainly ſhew, that the moſt vehement Accuſers, are the greateſt Offenders; and that they are indeed at this time the greateſt Schiſmaticks, who make the way to Salvation narrower, the Yoke of Chriſt heavier, the difference of Faith greater, the *Conditions of Eccleſiaſtical Government harder and ſtraiter*, than they were made at the beginning by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: they who talk of Unity, but aim at Tyranny, and will have Peace with none but with their Slaves and Vaſſals.

*Dr.* STILLINGFLEET's *Iren.* p. 119.

LEt Men turn and wind themſelves which way they will, by the very ſame Arguments that any will prove Separation from the Church of *Rome* lawful, becauſe ſhe required unlawful things, as Conditions of her Communion, it will be proved lawful not to conform to any ſuſpected or unlawful Practice required by any Church-Governours upon the ſame Terms, if the things ſo required be, after ſerious and ſober Enquiry, judged unwarrantable by a Man's own Conſcience.

590

CHILLINGWORTH's *Safe Way*, p. 180.

WHen we ſhall come to the Queſtion of Schiſm, I perſuade my ſelf, that I ſhall plainly ſhew, that the moſt vehement Accuſers, are the greateſt Offenders; and that they are indeed at this time the greateſt Schiſmaticks, who make the way to Salvation narrower, the Yoke of Chriſt heavier, the difference of Faith greater, the *Conditions of Eccleſiaſtical Government harder and ſtraiter*, than they were made at the beginning by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: they who talk of Unity, but aim at Tyranny, and will have Peace with none but with their Slaves and Vaſſals.

*Dr.* STILLINGFLEET's *Iren.* p. 119.

LEt Men turn and wind themſelves which way they will, by the very ſame Arguments that any will prove Separation from the Church of *Rome* lawful, becauſe ſhe required unlawful things, as Conditions of her Communion, it will be proved lawful not to conform to any ſuſpected or unlawful Practice required by any Church-Governours upon the ſame Terms, if the things ſo required be, after ſerious and ſober Enquiry, judged unwarrantable by a Man's own Conſcience.

591

A

# REPLY

To the Reverend

## Dean of St. PAUL'S's Reflections

ON THE

## RECTOR of SUTTON, &c.

WHEREIN

The Principles and Practices of the Non-conformists are not only vindicated by *Scripture*, but by Dr. *Stillingfleet's Rational Account*, as well as his *Irenicum*; as also by the Writings of the Lord *Faulkland*, Mr. *Hales*, Mr. *Chillingworth*, &c.

By the same Hand.

To which is added,

## St. Paul's Work Promoted;

OR,

Proper Materials drawn from *The true and only way of Concord*, and *Pleas for Peace*, and other late Writings of Mr. *Richard Baxter*, for uniting Protestant Dissenters, and repairing a Divided Church.

*LONDON*,

Printed by *J. D.* to be Sold by *Richard Janeway*, in Queens-Head Alley in *Pater-noster-Row*, 1681.

A

# A REPLY

To the Reverend

DEAN of St. PAULS's

# REFLECTIONS

ON THE

RECTOR of SUTTON, &c.

NOw thanks (Sir) for your Token; I would have said *New-Years-Gift*, had it come about a Fortnight sooner. Some told me lately an Answer was coming forth to my Notes upon the Doctor's Sermon; but I could not imagin how I should have a fair and just Answer from him, without his putting forth *another Edition* of his *Irenicum*, (and it must be *Another* indeed, quite different from the former;) or else giving us an *Index Expurgatorius* to the former, that we may know what he would have expunged; or (which would have been most satisfactory, and not unreasonable) his publishing a *Book of Retractations*, shewing in what Particulars, and upon what Grounds and Reasons his Mind is since changed.

Upon the perusal of this voluminous Writing of his, which must pass for a *Confutation* of his Five Answerers; I can find so little or nothing said to me, that were it not for *Three Conclusions* he lays down in his *Preface*, (p. 72, 73.) and *Three Letters*, which for my sake, upon account of what I had said (as it seems Preface *pag.* 76.) he annexeth as an *Appendix*, at the End of his Book, I should not have thought my self concerned to make any Reply.

I cannot find, that ever he vouchſafes to take notice of ſo much as one of my *Twelve Queries*, which (though I remember they were written in great haſte, yet) ſome of them (I think) are pinching.

My *Firſt Query* (to name no more) wiſe, impartial Men think it would have been an Act of *Juſtice* and Honeſty, as well as of *Charity*, Ingenuity, Self-denial, for him to have well conſidered, and to have given a ſerious and ſatisfactory Anſwer unto. How knoweth he, but ſome, yea, many may have that to ſay to him, *Si Error eſt quod credo, a te deceptus ſum*, If I be in an Error, you have led me into it, or have helpt to confirm me in it.

I thought I had demonſtrated to the Doctor, that he was *beſides his Text*. That the Word, the Scripture-Rule is that *ſame Rule* the Apoſtle would have Chriſtians walk by (*Phil* 3. 16.) And that the *Eſtabliſht Rule*, the Doctor would have it applyed to, is ſuch a Rule, as he himſelf hath told the World, the Apoſtles and *Primo-Primitive* Chriſtians had not. And if they had no ſuch Rule, nor would ever have eſtabliſht ſuch a Rule, then it certainly follows, the Apoſtle ſhould not be ſuppoſed there to preſs Chriſtians to *walk by ſuch a Rule*, (which was no Rule with him) [viz. *Rector of Sutton*, p. 10, 11, 17, & 18.] Yet I obſerve, where he pretends to clear the Text from all Objections, (*pag.* 163 *to* 176.) he ſays not one word to this *Material Objection*. And ſo he waves what Mr. *Baxter* ſays; (Anſwer *pag.* 29.) What he replieth to others, I ſuppoſe they will conſider. Here (I conceive) he cannot well ſay, as *pag.* 333. "*I decline* "*doubing that look like Argument*. And *pag.* 393. "*I have not concealed the* "*Force and Strength I ſaw in any of them.*

There I thought it ſufficient to argue from the Doctor's former *Conceſſions*, or rather his plain *Aſſertions*, taking the Matter to be ſo clear and evident, that no ſober Man, and much leſs he, would deny. But if he had put me to *prove*, that the Apoſtles did not, neither would ever eſtabliſh ſuch a Rule, nor could have eſtabliſhed it, (as Apoſtles as commiſſionated by Chriſt, as infallible Guides and Governours of the Church) I ſhould have counted it an *eaſie Task*, eſpecially when he hath done it ſo well to my hand, from *Act.* 15. 28, &c. This one hint may ſuffice at preſent, the Apoſtle *Peter was to be blamed*, for that by his Example, only he would have drawn the Gentile-Believers at *Antioch* to *Conformity* to the Jewiſh Ceremonies, *Gal.* 2. 11, 14. *Why compelleſt thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?* The Apoſtle *Paul*, who thus reproved him, yet ſays himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 9. 20. *Unto the Jews, I became as a Jew.* — And thoſe Ceremonies he conformed to among the Jewes, (as at *Jeruſalem*) were in themſelves *as lawful* and *innocent*, as the Ceremonies impoſed among us. But he would not have the Gentiles *compell'd* to more than was neceſſary. He that was ſo moved,

and

and offended, to ſee but an *Example* leading that way, how much more would he have *withſtood* any (one, or more) that were for *eſtabliſhing ſuch a Rule?* Yet the Doctor tells us, he is certain, he did not miſtake the ſence of his Text, Preface *pag.* 63.

But let ſuch things paſs, as the Doctor hath pleaſed to do. And if he had let all paſs that hath been ſaid, that the Controverſies he hath raiſed, might have been laid aſleep, or had uſed other Methods and Meaſures than he hath taken, I ſhould have been better ſatisfied, than I can be with his preſent Anſwer. I am ſorry we did not all put him in mind of that, *Præſtat motos componere fluctus.* However (Sir) I muſt acknowledg your Kindneſs, in ſending me this [*Impartial Account*, &c.] (as it is called) and that you have ſince furniſhed me with his [*Rational Account*] alſo, wherein you have greatly pleaſured me. Many Years ſince I looked into it, and doubted not, (when I was writing thoſe former Papers) but I could have made ſome uſe of it; but I could not then meet with the Book, for want of which I looked on thoſe Collections as incompleat.

Truly (Sir) I was in hopes the learned Doctor had retained that ſame Spirit of Moderation towards his diſſenting Brethren, which thoſe ſober moderate Principles he hath publiſhed, and commended unto others heretofore, ſpake him to have. How ſtrange is it, that the Reverend Doctor, ſhould ever forget the *Rector of Sutton?* And is it not as ſtrange, that he ſhould be for ſilencing ſuch a one (as of Sciſmatical Principles?) Or to ſpeak more plainly, ſhould be aſhamed to own him in that worthy Work, ſo full of Learning and Judgment, meriting Praiſe, rather than Cenſure: But it is too plain here, he hath deſerted the *Rector of Sutton*, and that *in a Matter wherein* he was in the right, and *had the ſtrongeſt Reaſon on his ſide*, and hath *given up the Cauſe* to ſuch an impoſing Party, as before he had condemned. And what is the matter, that the Reverend Doctor is ſo highly offended at me, for deſiring he would renew his old Acquaintance with one ſo near him, and be friends again? None in the World being nearer to him, if that be true, *Proximus ſum egomet mihi*; unleſs he will ſay, and make that good (in none of the beſt ſence) *Ego non ſum ego.* Now I am heartily ſorry, if we may *ſee Reaſon to change our Opinion* of him, as he ſays we may, *of ſome Perſons, as well as Things, in twenty Years time*, (Preface *pag.* 76.)

Sure I am, it either does, or ought to grieve me at heart, to ſee his Hand at ſuch dividing Work, who of all the dignified Perſons in *England*, I had thought, was ſpecially engaged, and hoped alſo, was as well enclined, to promote Union what in him lay; but not to widen Differences, by preſſing and pleading ſo hard for Dividing-Terms. When certain Biſhops were met, that ſought nothing more, than that poor *Athanaſius*

might be oppressed, *Dolet, Calumnia, & malis artibus Populantur*: Fetching it, rose up, and took *Maximus* (who, as I remember, had been a *Confessor*) by the hand, saying, *Nequa te deest ista in vos fides.* So I thought it least became the Reverend Doctor to appear with the forwardest in condemning his dissenting Brethren, whose Cause he had so well pleaded in time past. He begins his Preface with a Story of the learned and excellent Bishop *Jewell*, (which I leave to others to examine) But here I call to mind the Story of Bishop *Lindsey*, a Scottish-Bishop, who before he came to his Dignity, had given this Question at St. *Andrew's*, *Whether things indifferent once abused, and for their Abuse abolished?* &c. *Negatur.* Where he could bid Defiance to those that were for retaining such Ceremonies. Yet afterwards he was a zealous Contender for them, turning *Disce pati*, into *Dissipata*. And the great complaint of him was, that in dealing with his Brethren, he remembred not what he was once himself, that he pitied not his former Case (as some of them said) in their Persons, as *Augustine* did the *Manichees*, greater Heretick than he took them to be, *Let them be fierce* (rigorous) *against you, who never were deceived with the like Error, as they see you. But as for me, I ought not such Rigor against you, with whom I might so bear now, as I did at that time with my self*, &c. Thus I could wish the Doctor would be as favourable as it becometh him to be, in his Censures of his Brethren, who are very much of the same mind, he was of once.

And therefore I shall once again apply my self to him.

*Reverend Sir*;

I do not very well know, whether that Title [*The Rector of Sutton committed with the Dean of St. Paul's*] makes you more angry, or merry. This I know, those Papers of mine went out of my hands, without any Title: who put that to it I know not.

The Title, you say, (*Preface* p. 71.) "*Was enough to make the common* "*People imagine this was some Case of Justice of Peace, who had taken them* "*both at a Conventicle.*" And I confess the word [*Committed*] might puzzle those that could not English *bonos inter sese committere* (there p. 7.) But sure you had no thought of my being a *Justice of Peace*, any more than I should suspect the *Dean of St. Paul's* (since I have heard of, and seen what he hath both preached, and written against them) would frequent Conventicles. However you rub up my Memory here, that I have one thing to put you in mind of, though perhaps you'l call me a base *Informer* for it, in your Next. And yet call me at your pleasure, so this may incline you to more favourable Thoughts of *truly Religious Assemblies*, such as you have condemned, as *Conventicles*, and *Seperate Meetings*. In the former times of *England's* Distractions and Confusions, I being unsatisfied

of

597

of the Lawfulness of keeping (in publick) either those days of Thanksgiving for Victories, or of Fasting and Prayer for a Blessing on those Counsels, and Forces that then were; (as appointed) it happened that Mr. S. preached in my place upon one of these Fast-days (I suppose at the Request of some, but unknown to me) The Text in *Deut.* *For this is your Wisdom*, &c. which some remember still, though it is about twenty Years since, when I (at the same time) had a private Meeting at St. *Lawrence's*, as one called it. This I confess may look something like a personal Reflection: but my end here is, that you would be pleased to resolve me these Queries, *viz.*

Whether ever you accounted this Act Schismatical, preaching without the Consent of the *Rector* of the Parish? Or the Assembly that joyned, at that time, Schismaticks? Yet was here no breach of Order. Or were there no Churches in *England* then, or till your establisht Rule came in? And yet, Sir, I had never the less Esteem of Mr. S. at that time, or of others, who were satisfied to go farther than I durst.

Again, Whether was our private Meeting at that time a sinful Conventicle, when the far greater part of the Parish was with him at Church? I hope you will grant it was a lawful, because a Loyal Conventicle.

But so much to your Reflection on the *Title* of my former Papers. Now Sir, consider whether we have not more just Exceptions against this of yours.

(1.) The *unreasonableness of Separation.*] Here 1. Consider whether you do not condemn that as *Separation*, which is not. And is that reasonable? All Assemblies, distinct from yours, are not separate Meetings, as the Word is used in an evil sence: no, though they differ in some unnecessary Mode, or Circumstances of Worship, many that ordinarily joyn with you in the substantial parts of Worship, and meet not in Opposition; yet I cannot discern, but their Meetings fall under your Censure, as much as others, because they keep not to your establish'd Rule, when (*Preface pag.* 40.) you speak of an *unaccountable Separation, without regard to the greatness or smallness of Parishes*, &c. doth not that imply, that there may be some Account given for assembling to worship God, where there is a regard to this, to the Abilities and Piety of Ministers, and to the Peace and Order of the Church? And therefore the thing is not so *unreasonable* as you would make it. (2.) What if I prove (in examining your Three Conclusions) from the Principles you lay down in your *Irenicum*, and *Rational Account* too, that many are necessitated to separate from your Communion; Is Separation unreasonable, when necessary? Or will you allow others to say, that there you have pleaded for *unreasonable Separation*?

(2.) An

(2.) An *Impartial Account*, &c. you call it. Here I might say, I was glad to see you promising *Impartiality* in this Work, having found so little of it in your Sermon; but upon search *Quantâ de spe decidi?* The Partiality you have discovered is so great, and in so many Particulars, that if I should *ransack every Corner of your Book* (as you speak) to collect all such Passages, I fear I should be very tedious and irksome to you and other Readers. But

1. May not some of the common People, who have read either what Mr. *Baxter* says of it, or Mr. *Newcomen* (in *Serm.* on *Nov.* 5. 1642.) take you to be partial in setting down the Jesuit *Contzens* Directions for reducing Popery (*Preface pag.* 19, 20.) In that you take no notice of *putting out of Honours, Dignities, and publick Offices such as are most adverse to Popery*, or of the *outing of Ministers*, as unpeaceable, proud, obstinate, disobedient to Magistrates: And *forbidding them privately, or publickly to assemble?* And take no notice of that, *How easie is it* (as he says) *in* England *to bring the Puritans into Order, if they be forced to approve of* Bishops? &c. Here I think of your Words, *pag.* 10. "*I do not say, such Men* "*are set on by Jesuits, but I say, they do their work as effectually.*—— So it would be considered, whether such Methods do not effectually promote the Jesuits design of reducing Popery. You may give us to understand (*Preface pag.* 22.) that *the Declaration of Indulgence* 167½ *was of the Papists procuring*; but we must not say, that the turning out of many zealous Protestant Justices, and Ministers, was any way by their means.

2. Are you impartial in the Account you give of the Reformation in King *Edward* 6. and Q. *Elizabeth*'s Raign? Did the Reformation lie in those things wherein Dissenters differ from you? Then you must say, that those Churches which *aimed at an exact Conformity with the Apostolick Times*, and (as *Chillingworth* says) *took their Direction only from Scripture*, were yet so far unreformed, as they wanted our Ceremonies. Though it soundeth very harshly, to say that those Churches who were more conformed to the Scripture-Rule, were less reformed. But you spake more impartially, and more to the honour of our First Reformers, *Irenic. pag.* 124. which you was minded of, (*Rector of Sutton* p. 6.) *Certainly those holy Men, who did seek by any means to draw in others*, &c. And by that *Rubrick*, which left it at the discretion of the Minister, what, and how much to read, when there was a Sermon, it is evident, others since have sought to bear up their Authority by their Names, who have been far from their Moderation.

I cannot but wonder at your *Harangue* (Book *pag.* 6.) "*Is it credible*, "*that Men of so great Integrity, such indefatigable Industry, such profound* "*Judgment*, as Cranmer *and* Ridley, *who were the Heads of the Reformation*, *should*

*should discern no Sinfulness in these things.* —— *Could not* Latimer, *or* Bradford, *or such holy, mortified Men as they, discern so much as a Mote of Unlawfulness?* &c.

It is granted, they were Learned, Pious, Excellent Men; yet it need not seem strange, much less incredible, that such worthy Men should in some things mistake. Does not *A. B. Land* tell you, *Reformation is so difficult a Work, and subject to so many Pretentions, that 'tis almost impossible but the Reformers should step too far, or fall too short in some smaller things or other?* I suppose you may have Bishop *Cranmer*'s Manuscripts still by you; and are you of his Judgment in all things? I do not find it so, comparing what you published, as his Judgment in your *Irenicum*, and what you have published in this Book, as your own. And *Latimer*, that Zealous and Faithful Martyr, (as I remember) at the end of his Sermons, used to excite the Hearers to Prayer, and therein to *remember such as were departed this Life.* Now must we therefore conclude, there is not a Mote of Unlawfulness in praying for the Dead, that otherwise such an holy Man as *Latimer*, would not have been for it? Most true it is, considering the Times they lived in, and the Temper of the Persons they had to deal with, it was the great Work of God to carry on Reformation so far by them. But I cannot say, but their Hearts were to have carried it on further, if the Times would have born it. (More Shame it is to others, that have had fairer Opportunities since, and yet have not minded the Work.) *History of the Troubles at Frankford* (printed 1575, reprinted 1642. *p.* 42.) telleth of one that said, Bishop *Cranmer* had drawn up a Book of Prayer, an hundred times more perfect, but the Clergy and Convocation with other Enemies would not let it pass. And there followeth something further worth your noting (*pag.* 43.) that *Bullinger* told *Whittingham*, Mr. *H.* and Mr. *C.* asked his Judgment concerning certain Points of that (our) Book, as *Surplice, private Baptism, Churching Women, the Ring in Marriage*, with such like, which (as he said) he allowed not, and that he neither could if he would, neither would if he might use the same in his Church, whatsoever had been reported. Therefore (say I) such a Man as *Bullinger* would not have been for imposing the same on others.

As to the Reformation in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, it was not brought in, nor brought on with a rigorous Imposition of those things in Controversie; as *Ball* against *Can*, Part 2. *p.* 13. In the first ten Years of Q. *Elizabeth*, there was sweet consent among Brethren. —— I think there was not a Man that thought of Separation. The *pressing of Subscription and Conformity in the tenth year of* Q. Elizabeth's *Raign*, was that which brought in all the Troubles and Contentions following. *Josias Nichol's* (*Plea of the Innocent*, p. 216, 217, printed 1602.) thus: Some five Years together

together, before that unhappy time that Subscription was so generally offered, (which is now some 18. Years past) there was such Unity between the Ministers, and they joyned in all places so lovingly, and diligently in Labour; that not only did the unpreaching Minister and Non-resident quake, and prepare themselves in measure to take pains in the Church; but also many thousands were converted from *Atheism* and *Popery*, &c. But *when Subscription came abroad*, how did it shake the Heavens, and darken the Skies? (O Lord my Heart trembleth to think upon it) how many godly, and worthy learned Preachers were silenced, deprived, and greatly disgraced! How were the holy Ministers divided and distracted! How were the Christian Subjects grieved and offended, and the Papists and wicked Men encouraged and emboldened! What a damp brought it to all Godliness and Religion? and since that time what horrible Wickedness, Whoredom, Drunkenness, and all shameless Filthiness, and what grievous Plagues of God, one succeeding another, have followed, every good Christian Subject must needs see and lament? So he who was no *Separatist*. And I hope Sir, you and I are agreed, that these things last spoken of, were *no part of* England's *Reformation*. And now Sir, give me leave to tell you (in some of your own Words, *Preface* p. 47.) *We were in a lamentable case as to the Defence of the Reformation, if we had no more to plead for it*, (then we have indeed to plead for such mischievous Impositions.) And this seems to have been the sence of the *Queen's Council* in that Letter, which the *modest Enquiry* (p. 16, 27.) lays before you.

Therefore Sir, I beseech you, as you would not *blast the Credit, and Honour of the Reformation*, place it not in such things, as rather brought a *Deformation* on us.

Here I know not well how to reconcile you to your self. For, p. 365. You say, "It was the great Wisdom of our Church not to make more "things necessary (as to Practice) than were made so at the Settlement "of our Reformation; but whether there be sufficient Reason to alter those "Terms of Communion which were then settled, for the sake of such "whose Scruples are groundless and endless, I do not take upon me here "to determine. And *Preface* p. 53. "Although the Arguments are very "plausible one way, yet the Objections are very strong *another*. The Union "of Protestants, the Ease of scrupulous Consciences, the providing for so "many poor Families of ejected Ministers (but not a word of providing for so many poor Congregations, and dark corners of the Land, that have need of them) "*Are great Motives on one side*. But the *weighty Considerati-* "*ons on the other side*, pag. 54. And *double in number* too, as you reckon. So here I see your Mind, as you hold the Scales, you might, and would determine that there is *no sufficient Reason to alter those Terms of Communion*,

which

*which (in the great Wiſdom of our Church) were ſetled, for the ſake of ſuch, whoſe Scruples are groundleſs and endleſs.* For certainly thoſe Arguments that are only *plauſible* with you, would not weigh down ſuch as are *ſtrong* and cogent, nor a few Motives weigh down more *weighty Conſiderations.* But then, what did you think of, when you put that Queſtion, *Preface*, p. 81. 'Is there nothing to be done for Diſſenting Proteſtants? —— Do 'we value a few indifferent Ceremonies, and ſome late Declarations, and 'doubtful Expreſſions, beyond the ſatisfaction of Mens Conſciences, and 'the Peace and Stability of this Church? And how happy had *England* been, if ſuch things had not been ſo over-valued! *As to this material Queſtion, you deliver your Opinion* (you ſay) *freely and impartially.* How Sir! what? Are you for *altering what was ſetled in ſo great Wiſdom, by Men of ſo great Integrity, ſuch indefatigable Induſtry, ſuch profound Judgment? Is this for the Honour of our Reformation? Is not this to blaſt the Credit of the Reformation?*

I ſhall not take upon me, to animadvert upon the whole of your Anſwer to this *material Queſtion*, preſuming it will be ſcann'd by ſome of better Judgment. Only one or two things I cannot but take notice of. So I heartily thank you for that, *P.* 82. (3.) 'Notwithſtanding, becauſe the 'uſe of Sacraments in a Chriſtian Church ought to be the moſt free from 'all Exceptions, and they ought to be ſo adminiſtred, as rather to invite 'than diſcourage ſcrupulous Perſons from joyning in them; I do think, it 'would be a part of Chriſtian Wiſdom and Condeſcenſion (*only here I would 'ſay*, Duty) in the Governours of our Church, to remove thoſe Bars from 'a Freedom in joyning in a full Communion. Now thanks for thus much: and hold to it, Sir. Tho I have two great and learned Men of the Church of *England* (worthy of Note with you) juſt at hand, that grant as much of other parts of God's Worſhip, as you do of Sacraments; *ſcil.* that they ſhould be free from all Exceptions. See *Hales* of Schiſm, (in *Miſcel. p.* 216, 217, 218.) And you were once of his Mind, *Irenic. p.* 120. And *Chillingworth*, p. 180. *If all Men would believe the Scripture, and freeing themſelves from Prejudice and Paſſion, would ſincerely endeavour to find the true Sence of it, and live according to it, and require no more of others, but to do ſo; nor denying their Communion to any that do ſo, would ſo order their publick Service of God, that all which do ſo, may without Scruple, or Hypocriſy, or protetestation againſt any part of it, joyn with them in it: who does not ſee that,* &c.

Again, I caſt my Eye on that, *p.* 87. where you would have indulged Perſons to pay Twelve pence a Sunday for their abſence from the Parochial Churches, which (you ſay) *cannot be complained of as any heavy Burthen.* Which ſuch will not thank you for. You would have them indulged, and not indulged. And is Twelve Pence a Week no burden to thoſe, that

602



with hard Labour have much ado to maintain their Families, can scarce clear Twelve Pence per Week? See what it is to be rich in this World, that makes some insensible of the low Estate others live in. And would you have Servants thus *polled* too? tho their Wages may not amount to so much.

But now at last I come to that, which I said, makes you hardly reconcileable to your self. *Preface, p. 92.* 'Such a Review made by wise and 'peaceable Men, not given to Wrath, and Disputing, may be so far from 'being a Dishonour to this Church, that it may add to the Glory of it. And the like you must say, of *removing those Bars to Communion in Sacraments*, because it would be a *part of Christian Wisdom*. Now lay things together, Dr. *Stilling.* says, *Preface*, p. 53, 54. *There are strong Objections, and weighty Considerations against the Alteration* of the established Laws. And *p.* 364. would not take upon him to determine, *Whether there be sufficient Reason to alter those terms of Communion settled.* And yet Dr. *Stilling.* says, *Preface*, p. 82, 92. That an *Alteration would be a part of Christian Wisdom*, and so *far from being a dishonour to this Church, that it would add to the Glory of it.* And hereupon I put this Query, Whether Men are justly charged, as *blasting the Honour of the Reformation*, for dissenting in such things, which it would be the *Churches Glory to alter?*

3. Are you *Impartial* in the Account you give of the *old-Non-Conformists*, as if it was their general Sence, that Ministers were to *forbear all Preaching*, when silenced? In the *Contents* of your Book, *Part.* 1 § 17. it is thus, [*The old Non-conformists Judgment of the unlawfulness of Mens preaching here, when forbidden by Laws, fully cleared from some late Objections.*] Which you undertake, *p.* 78. *&c.* That their Judgment and Practice was to forbear preaching in *their Parish Churches*, while they were under Suspension, I grant. And did not the present Non-conformists follow them herein? Did they not generally quit the *Temples*, as well as their *Tithes, and Profits*, from *Aug.* 24. 62. yielding these to be at the Magistrates dispose? They would not that you, or others, should call their Preaching (as you do) *preaching in opposition* to established Laws, whereunto they yielded, as far as they could be satisfied it was lawful for them. But do you your self believe, that the *old Non-conformists* thought it unlawful for them to preach at all, when silenced? Then you cannot take them to have been very honest, upright Men, who did so ordinarily recede from their own Principles. Were not some of them glad of an opportunity of Preaching in another Diocess, when they might not be suffered to preach where they lived? And were not many of them for the exercise of their Ministry in private, when they were denied liberty in publick. *Fr. Johnson* speaks of their suffering themselves to be deposed from their (stated) *publick Ministry*,

which

608

which you ſeem to overlook. And ſo I think *Beza* may well be underſtood of quitting their former *publick Employments* (with whoſe Teſtimony you make ſo great a Flouriſh, *p.* 21, 22.) 'What! is *Beza* for ſilencing, and 'ſtopping the Mouths of ſuch a number of faithful and able Miniſters? —— 'Would *Beza*, even *Beza*, at ſuch a time as that, be for ſilencing ſo many 'Preachers? ——It appears that *Beza* was not of the Mind of our Adver'ſaries——That he expreſſeth no ſuch terrible apprehenſions at their quit'ting their Places, as he doth at their Preaching in oppoſition to the Laws. To which I return, Were not the Non-conformiſts generally, both at that time, and ſince, for *quitting their Places*, rather than holding on in publick, to the defiance of the Laws? They have deſired, as far as they could, to avoid the exaſperating of Rulers. They were not for *oppoſing Sword to Sword*, as *Bradſhaw* has it; they were not movers of Sedition, nor have been to this day. And would Mr. *Baxter*, even Mr. *Baxter*, be for their ſilencing; yet he ſays, (in his *Search for the Engliſh Schiſmatick*, *p.* 37.) 'It 'is not their Judgment (ſpeaking of the meer Non-conformiſts) that they 'are bound to Preach, when by oppoſing violence, or the offending of Ru'lers, it is likely to do more hurt than good, and once preaching to deprive 'them of all the uſefulneſs of their Lives, *&c.*

But I doubt not, there are many Chriſtians yet alive, who can remember ſome of the old Non-conformiſts, and their *preaching in private Houſes*, when ſuſpended from Preaching in Churches. One writes me word, that Mr. *Hilderſam* uſed to preach in his own Houſe, when ſilenced; and two or three Families came to hear him. Another ſpecial Friend, helping me to a ſight of ſome Papers of Mr. E. *Reyner* (formerly) of *Lincoln*, I meet with this conſiderable Paſſage: 'For me to preach in this Place, and at 'this Time, is no way neceſſary, ſince others may do it, and I my ſelf '(tho put by here) may do it as well and freely elſewhere, as in *New-* 'England, Ireland, Scotland, Holland; yea, haply in ſome remote out-wing of 'the Kingdom. And thus God (in his ordinary Providence) doth order it, 'that his Church gains much by this courſe of removing Miniſters, and 'tranſplanting the Goſpel to ſuch Places, as never heard the ſound thereof 'before; and in the mean while they may have time to do much good in 'private, *&c.* And I think this was the general Sence of the Non-conformiſts, that they did not look on the cenſure of Suſpenſion, (if unjuſt) as a ſufficient diſcharge from the exerciſe of their Miniſtry. Had they thought themſelves bound to ceaſe Preaching, whenſoever they were prohibited by Men, they were honeſter Men, than to act ſo contrary to their Judgment; as they uſed frequently to preach, (tho more privately, or in Places where they were not known) when ſuſpended by the Biſhops. But theſe things were not to be publickly talkt of then, when the *High Commiſſion-Court*

was up, and there was such Inquisition after their Meetings.

I have this Account of Mr. *Simeon Ash*, from one (whose Father's House was as his home sometimes) that when he was sought after by Pursevants, coming to them, they had Meetings in the Night-time. Another, (a Minister) tells me he hath heard from Ancient Christians in *Ringly* Congregation, that Mr. *John Angier*, sometimes Minister there, being silenced, and having his Chappel suspended by the *Bishop of Chester*, used to preach to divers in his own House, till such times as he was removed to *Denton*. I suppose, there are some in those Parts (yet alive) that can testify so much; Mr. *Westowbye* I well knew. His *Bible* was his *Licence*. The Courts could not take him off, but he would be at his Work, in one place or other. Once after my preaching for him, (when he was scarce able to get into the Pulpit for Age, and Weakness accompanying it) he entertained me with a Discourse of much of his Life past, the Troubles and Opposition he had met with in the World, and the great Experience he had of the most *encouraging Success* of his Ministry under his greatest Troubles, that in his Travels he could write to his Wife, (as he said) that *God had given him many Children* she knew not of.

But to enquire after the Practice of particular Persons would be a tedious and endless Work. You have the *Judgment of the Assembly*, under that Head of *Ordination*, where they would have the Person to be ordained, declare his *sincere Intentions* and Ends in entring into this Calling: And his *Resolution* to continue *against all Trouble and Persecution*. If that Assembly were *Non-conformists*, then you see there the *Judgment of the Non-conformists*. But if they were generally *Conformists*, then you see, we have the Judgment of a Learned Synod of *Conformists* for us.

4. Are you not too *partial* in *allowing Protestants to be occasionally present at some parts of Worship in the Roman Church, and that frequently too, to hear Sermons*, &c. (how far your *et cætera* may reach, others cannot tell, till you better inform them) while you do not allow them to be present at the Worship performed in the Assemblies of Dissenters? The former you are for, *pag.* 108. To your Question there, *doth this make a Man to have Communion with the Church of Rome?* I answer, yea, so far as he joyns in their Worship, so far he has Communion with them. Sure you will not deny a Man to have any Communion with you in hearing the Word preached, who comes for that End, and that frequently too. So here you must be supposed to grant *Occasional Communion with the Roman Church* in hearing of Sermons, *&c*, and *that frequently too*, to be lawful. Now this is more than you allow to Dissenters, *pag.* 98. "No Man denies, that more places for "Worship are desireable, and would be very useful, where they may be "had, and the same way of Worship, and Order observed in them, as in

"our

" our Parochial Churches; where they may be under the ſame Inſpection, " and Eccleſiaſtical Government.—— But, is it poſſible that Mr. *B.* " ſhould think the Caſe alike, where the Orders of our Church are con- " ſtantly neglected, the Authority of the Biſhops is ſlighted and contem- " ned; and ſuch Meetings are kept up in Affront to them, and the Laws? Here you ſay in Effect, that let Pariſhes be never ſo large, and the Ne- ceſſities of Souls never ſo urgent, the Aſſemblies of Diſſenters are not deſirable, nor to be encouraged, becauſe not under your eſtabliſh'd Rule. But either you muſt grant, it may be lawful to *joyn occaſionally, and that frequently too*, with the *Non-conformiſts*, or you muſt judg them worſe than *Popiſh Teachers*, and ſay that it was better for Men to hear theſe, than ſuch as Mr. *B.* &c. I know not whether you might fear the leaſt counte- nancing of *occaſional Communion* with *Non-conformiſts*, leſt any ſhould thence argue from your own Words, that *conſtant Communion with them is a Duty*. I am thinking however, that the Papiſts may thank you for ſo much Kindneſs to them, that you grant it lawful for Proteſtants to be *occaſionally preſent* in ſome parts of their Worſhip. And let them alone to make their beſt of what you ſay, *you are ſure will follow*, *p.* 176. and *p.* 77. " As far as Men judg Communion lawful, it becomes a Duty, and Sepa- " ration a Sin; under what Denomination ſoever the Perſons paſs.—— " Becauſe then Separation appears moſt unreaſonable, when occaſional " Communion is confeſſed to be lawful. If they can get Proteſtants to joyn with them ordinarily, though but *in ſome parts of their Worſhip at firſt*, its poſſible, they would gain far more Proſelites by it, than *Non-conformiſts* have drawn or would draw into Separation.

You ſeem to ſuppoſe great Force and Virtue in that *Salvo*, p. 156. " A " Man is not ſaid to ſeparate from every Church, where he forbears or " ceaſes to have Communion; but only from that Church, with which " he is obliged to hold Communion. As if a Chriſtian was only obliged to Communion with ſome one particular Church. Yet you will look up- on your ſelf, not only as a *Member of the Church of* England, but as a *Member of the Catholick Church*. And as you are a Member of the Catho- lick Church, it may poſſibly ſometimes fall out, that you may be *obliged* to have *Communion occaſionally* with a *Dutch* Church, or a *French* Church. And if *Non-conformiſts*, with their Aſſemblies may be proved as ſound parts of the Church Catholick, as others you can freely have Communion with, and while they differ from you in nothing, but if the ſame was re- moved, your Churches might be every jot as ſound and pure, I can ſee *no ſufficient Reaſon* why you might not as *lawfully* have Occcaſional Com- munion with them; and then for ought I know, you may be obliged thereunto, it may be *a Duty*. Becauſe you wholly overlook this, I thought

fit

fit to take notice of it. And further I would put you in mind of your own Arguments, *pag.* 157. viz.

1. "The general Obligation upon Christians to use all lawful Means for "preserving the Peace and Unity of the Church. And here I ask, If there be not *as great an Obligation* at least, upon Christians to *preserve Peace*, or promote it *with all Christians, as with all Men*: And *they are bound to that, as far as possible, and as much as lies in them*, Rom. 12. 18. And if you supposed the present Dissenters to be as bad as the *Donatists*, (which you cannot in reason suppose) yet your Learned and Excellent *Hales* says, (*Miscel.* of Schism, *p.* 208.) *Why might it not be lawful to go to Church with the* Donatists? — *if occasion so require*, And *Ibid.* p. 209. *In all publick Meetings pretending Holiness, so there be nothing done but what true Devotion and Piety brook, why may not I be present in them, and use Communication with them?*

2. "The particular force of that Text, *Phil.* 3. 16. *Let us as you have* "*already attained, walk by the same Rule*, &c. And one would think, such as have attained so much Knowledg, as to see it *lawful to joyn with the Roman Church in some parts of Worship*, might know, it cannot but be as lawful at least to joyn in Worship with *Non-conformists*.

5. Are you not *partial*, when you lay this down; (*p.* 157.) "As one of "the provoking Sins of the *Non-conformists*, that they have been so back-"ward in doing what they were convinced they might have done, with "a good Conscience, when they were earnestly pressed to it by those in "Authority, *&c.* (yet you tell us not what things those are, neither the time when they were pressed thereunto, and refused the same. And I never heard of any Motions or Overtures for Peace, that were reasonable, made to them, which they refused.) But you never take notice of it, as any *provoking* Sin, in those that would not hearken to their most just and earnest *Petition for Peace*. Might not they with a good Conscience have forborn those *needless Impositions*, which they very well knew would be so grievous and burdensome to many? And might not so much have been expected from them, as they would profess themselves to be for *Unity and Peace*? May I not here return your own Words; *pag.* 159. "Was ever "Schism made so light a matter of, and the Peace and Unity of Christi-"ans valued at so low a Rate; that for the Prevention of the one, and the "Preservation of the other, a thing that is lawful may not be done? (Or as I would say, that the imposing of things *indifferent*, and *not neces-sary*, in their own Judgment, but things *doubtful, or unlawful* in the Judg-ment of others, might not be forborn?)

Now, (Sir) are you for *palliating so great Sin*, as the causing of Schism and Dissention in the Church, when you know, "The Obligation which "lieth

" lieth upon all Christians, to preserve the Peace and Unity of the Church, " (which you give us again, *p.* 209.) And I find you citing these words of *A. B. Land.* in your *Rational Account*, p. 324. " Not is he a Christian that " would not have Unity, might he have it with Truth. But I never said, " nor thought, that the Protestants made this Rent (Dissenting Protestants, say we) " The cause of the Schism is yours; for you thrust us from " you, because we called for Truth, and redress of Abuses. And there at the End of *pag.* 102. You could not but judg it a very prudent Expression of his Lordship, *That the Church of* England *is not such a Shrew to her Children, as to deny her Blessing, or denounce an* Anathema *against them, if some peaceably dissent in some Particulars remoter from the Foundation*, &c. Where I observe you cannot well plead the Cause of our *Separation from Rome*, without pleading something for Dissenters. But to return to your *Impartial Account*, p. 209. You say, " Violation of the Unity of the Church, " where there is no sufficient Reason to justify it, is a sin, as much as " Murder is, and as plainly forbidden (and in some respects aggravated be- " yond it, *Preface* p. 45.) All which returns upon your selves, if the Arch-Bishop's Words may take place. And consider further seriously, whether there be any sufficient Reason to justifie the pressing and imposing of those things, which might lawfully be forborn, when the imposing of them will certainly cause a Violation of the Churches Unity and Peace. Yet this is a thing, you take no notice of, unless it be to justify it. As *p. 76.* " The Church of *England* hath as much occasion to account those Scruples " unreasonable, as they do those of the *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, and " *Quakers*. And *pag.* 59. So it is impossible for them to answer the *Ana-* " *baptists*, who have as just a Plea for Separation from them, as they can " have from the Church of *England*. Now lay these together, and what follows, but that as much is to be pleaded for the *English Ceremonies*, and other things imposed, which the *Non-conformists* stick at, as can be pleaded for the baptizing of Infants, or against *Re-baptization* (and I may add, or against the way of the *Quakers*.) In the *Fifty Queries* concerning Infants Right to Baptism, I set that down last, which I desired they would specially observe, *Scil.* " Whether the Anabaptist's Schism be not worse " than their simple Opinion? And whether it be not desireable, and " possible, that some Way be found out, and Terms laid down in which " good and sober Men on both sides might agree, and hold Communion, (as Christians?) concerning which, something is proposed there (from Mr. *B.*) to others Consideration. This the Author of the *Anti-Queries* took little notice of, which engaged me to mind him of it again, in my *Reply*, p. 25, 26. And yet I have met with no other Answer from him, but that he is loth at present to give an Answer to it, intreating all his

Friends

Friends to take it into Conſideration, becauſe it is a *matter of Moment*, and *common Concern*. (*T. G's Controverſy*, &c. *epitomiſed*, p. 64.) From whence I conclude, if ſuch Terms of Moderation were offered, they would be hard put to it, ſcarce know what to ſay for a ſtanding off, and denying to have Communion with Chriſtians of a different Perſwaſion; but they would have enough to ſay againſt your Terms: and that from your ſelf, and not only in your *Irenicum*, but in your *Rational Account*, p. 209. 'It is a very 'neceſſary Enquiry, what the cauſe of (the diſtance) is, and where the 'main Fault lies; and it being acknowledged that there is a poſſibility, that 'Corruptions may get into a Chriſtian Church, and it being impoſſible to 'prove, that Chriſtianity obligeth Men to communicate with a Church, 'in all thoſe (they will ſay, in any) Corruptions, its Communion may 'be tainted with; it ſeems evident to Reaſon, that the cauſe of the Breach 'muſt lie there, where the Corruptions are owned, and impoſed, as Con-'ditions of Communion, *&c.*

I ſhould have hoped, that at leaſt you would have granted the conditions put upon Miniſters to be very hard; yet I find nothing, but *a deep ſilence* here. Tho Mr. *Cheny* ſays, 'I am ſatisfied that it is in it ſelf a great and 'dreadful Sin to ſilence the Non-conformiſts. It ſeems here is a *provoking Sin*, which you was willing to overlook, tho once in your Sermon, p. 20. you were very near it.

6. Do you ſpeak *Impartially*, p. 378, 379. when you tell us, you wonder, that *none of us have taken any care to put any ſtop to Separation, or to let you know, where you may fix and ſee an end of it; what Scruples are to be allowed, and what not?* I will ſay nothing for thoſe, who are better able to ſpeak for themſelves: but for my ſelf, I thought I had told you plainly, and ſufficiently out of your *Irenicum* (if you will not be offended that I call it *yours*) where I would have you fix. *Let Chriſtians ſtand upon the ſame terms now, as they did in the time of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Do not add other conditions of Church-Communion than Chriſt hath done.* (As *Rector of Sutton*, p. 6, 7. See alſo p. 59.) If you make no new Terms, and yet others will ſeparate from you ſtill, the Sin is *theirs*: but if indeed you add other Terms, then beware, that you be not found the *Schiſmaticks*.

Do not turn me off here, as you do Mr. *Baxter's Way of Concord*. You cannot juſtly ſay, we go on in *impracticable Notions* here, or dividing Principles. (When you have that Word, *Preface* p. 38. *As tho he had been Chriſt's Plenipotentiary upon Earth*, You forgot that others might as well apply it to the *Rector of Sutton*, for publiſhing his *Irenicum*.)

And I hope you will not deny, but we are backt with great Authority, when you conſider, what King *James* tells Cardinal *Du Perron*, by the Pen of *Iſaac Cauſabon*, (which Mr. *Baxter* takes notice of, *Direct.* p. 752.) *His Maje-*

609

*Majesty thinketh, that for Concord there is no nearer way, than diligently to ſeparate things neceſſary from the unneceſſary, and to beſtow all our labour that we may agree in the things neceſſary, and that in things unneceſſary, there may be place given for Chriſtian Liberty.* A Golden Sentence! And there is nothing that can be proved *neceſſary*, but it muſt be either *expreſly taught*, or *commanded* in the Word of God, or deduced thence by *neceſſary Conſequence*. And that of the Lord *Bacon* (*Eſſay* 3.) is conſiderable, who for the *true placing the Bonds of Unity, would have Points fundamental, and of Subſtance in Religion*, truly diſcerned and diſtinguiſhed from Points not meerly of Faith, but of *Opinion, Order*, or *good Intention*. And *Chillingworth* is full of ſuch *impracticable Notions*, (if they deſerve to be ſo called,) p. 197. —— *He that could aſſert Chriſtians to that Liberty, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles left them, muſt needs do Truth a moſt Heroical Service. And ſeeing the over-valuing of the Differences among Chriſtians, is one of the greateſt Maintainers of the Schiſme of Chriſtendom*, &c. p. 198. *Certainly if Proteſtants be faulty in this matter (of playing the Pope) it is for doing it too much, and not too little.* —*Take away theſe Walls of Separation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this Perſecuting, Burning, Curſing, Damning of Men, for not ſubſcribing to the Words of Men, as the Words of God: Require of Chriſtians only to believe Chriſt, and to call no Man Maſter but him only; Let thoſe leave claiming Infallibility, that have no Title to it; and let them that in their Words diſclaim it, diſclaim it likewiſe in their Actions. In a Word, take away Tyranny, which is the Devils Inſtrument to ſupport Errors, and Superſtitions, and Impieties.* —*I ſay, take away Tyranny, and reſtore Chriſtians to their juſt and full Liberty of captivating their Underſtanding to Scripture only; and as Rivers when they have a free Paſſage, run all to the Ocean: ſo it may well be hoped, by God's Bleſſing, that univerſal Liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Chriſtendom to Truth and Unity.* This Citation being ſo long, I ſhall add but one more out of him, and that a ſhorter, p. 209. *This is moſt certain, and I believe you will eaſily grant it, that to reduce Chriſtians to Unity of Communion, there are but two ways that may be conceived probable. The one, by taking away diverſity of Opinions, touching Matters of Religion: The other, by ſhewing that the diverſity of Opinions, which is among the ſeveral Sects of Chriſtians, ought to be no hinderance to their Unity in Communion.* Laſt of all, I cloſe with your *Rational Account*, p. 291. 'And 'therefore thoſe leſſer Societies cannot in Juſtice, make the neceſſary Con'ditions of Communion narrower, than thoſe which belong to the Catho'lick Church: *i. e.* thoſe things which declare Men Chriſtians, ought to 'capacitate them for Communion with Chriſtians. (Even an *acknowledgment of the Scriptures as the indiſpenſible Rule of Faith and Manners*: Which (be pleaſed to note) is ſomething different from your *late eſtabliſh'd Rule.*) Now would you fix here, that thoſe things which *declare Men Chriſtians*,

ſhall ſuffice to capacitate them for Communion with you; how many Mens Scruples would be removed? and what better way can you think of, to put a ſtop to Separation?

7. Are you *Impartial* in charging all Nonconformiſt's Meetings with *Separation*, tho very many of them ordinarily join with the Parochial Congregations, and do not deny them to be true Churches, as the old Separatiſts did? *p.* 56. 'It is true, (ſay you) in that Opinion they differ, but in Se-'paration they agree. As in your Sermon, *p.* 33. 'For do they not do the 'very ſame things, and in the ſame manner, that the others do? how 'comes it then to be Separation in ſome, and not in others? Which I anſwered (*Rector of Sutton, p.* 49.) thus: What they do is not done upon the Separatiſts Principles, and therefore not done in the ſame manner. Yet you neither *retract* that Saying of yours, nor *refute* my Anſwer. And have not others as much reaſon to object againſt you, that when you receive the Sacrament *kneeling*, you do the ſame thing that the *Papiſts* and *Lutherans* do; (I do not think it *manifeſtly appears from the Pope's manner of receiving, either ſitting, or a little leaning upon his Throne*, as you ſay, *p.* 15. that the Papiſts are allowed to follow him herein.) How then comes that to be an *Act of Worſhip* in them, when with you it is no Act of Worſhip, but a meer indifferent Ceremony?

8. Are you not very *Partial*, in loading thoſe that do not abſolutely ſeparate from you, but only *ſecundum quid*, as you do, *p.* 54, 55, 56. Making their Practice, that own you to be true Churches, to be the *more unjuſtifiable, more inexcuſable, more unreaſonable* Separation? Is it not a greater Schiſm, to ſeparate from you, as *no true Church*, than to do it, only becauſe you are *faulty*, in impoſing ſuch Conditions, as they cannot lawfully ſubmit to? Are they the greateſt Separatiſts, who hold Communion with you, ſo far as they can? I ſhould think, they are the greateſt Separatiſts, whoſe Separation is the moſt *unjuſtifiable, inexcuſable*, and *unreaſonable*. As I had thought, there was not ſo much reaſon to *deny the Being of the Church of England*, while ſhe retaineth the true Faith, and hath the true Worſhip of God for ſubſtance; as there may be to *doubt of the lawfulneſs of Ceremonies*, and Modes of Worſhip, invented and impoſed, without any clear Scripture-Warrant. And ſuppoſe one dares not receive the Communion with you, becauſe he holdeth *kneeling* in that Act a *participating with Idolaters*; and another is kept off, becauſe he ſuſpects there may be ſome *Superſtition* in it? will you ſay, the latter is the more unreaſonable? And do you not own thoſe *Lutheran* Churches, that have *Exorciſm* with Baptiſm, yet to be true Churches? And if you was placed there, muſt you therefore own and uſe Exorciſm, (tho againſt your Judgment) or be guilty of a more *inexcuſable, unreaſonable Separation* from them, than the Papiſts, who deny them to be true Churches?

9. Are

9. Are you *Impartial*, in allowing a different way of Worſhip, to the Members of *Forreign Churches* here in *England*, (as p. 147, 148.) while you are againſt allowing the like Liberty to Natives, which you deny not to Strangers? Biſhop *Davenant* (*Ad pacem Eccl. Adhort. p.* 116. *Rat* 3.) argues, *That none ought to deal more hardly, with their Chriſtian Brethren of other Churches, than with their own.* (Rom. 12. 5.) *Nam fraternitas Chriſtiana quæ intercedit inter membra Chriſti non variatur pro locorum aut nationum varietate.* You would have your own more hardly dealt with than thoſe of forreign Churches. Now what Equity is here? Either you have Communion with thoſe of *Forreign* Churches (notwithſtanding their different way of Worſhip) or you have not. If you have no Communion with them, then are you not *Schiſmaticks* from thoſe Churches? If you have Communion with them, why may you not as lawfully have Communion with Non-conformiſts in their way of Worſhip? Can you aſſign any juſt and ſufficient Cauſe *ex Natura rei*, why ſuch a way of Worſhip ſhould not be allowed?

10. Do you deal *Impartially*, while you complain, *p.* 112. that no *bounds are ſet to the Peoples Fancies of purer Adminiſtrations*; (concerning which I am quite miſtaken, if I did not wiſh the *Rector of Sutton* had cautioned what he ſaid) and you on the other hand, *ſet no Bounds*, but (by your excepting againſt what Mr. *B.* hath written of it) would have People own, and commit the care of their Souls to ſuch Miniſters, as are in place, be they never ſo profane, inſufficient, or unſound? Tho Mr. *Cheyney* (*Full Anſwer*, &c. *Introduct. p.* 7.) grants, *That where God doth make a difference, Men may. Now God doth make a difference* (ſays he) *between the Miniſtry of the beſt and the worſt, between the Miniſtry of a* John Baptiſt *and a Phariſee, a living Man and an Image.* P. 177. Say you, 'And doth this Kindneſs only belong to ſome 'of our Parochial Churches? *&c.* Where you ſuppoſe every Parochial Church in *England* to be a true Church, and every Parochial Miniſter (by conſequence) to be a true Miniſter; unleſs you would argue fallaciouſly there. Tho I had thought it poſſible to have found out ſome few at leaſt, whom you would have been aſhamed to own. I cannot but wonder at that you urge again and again. *p.* 111. 'Were they not baptized in this 'Church, and received into Communion with it as Members of it? *p.* 148. 'Our Buſineſs is with thoſe, who being baptized in this Church, *&c.* May not all thoſe that were baptized in *Preſbyterian*, or *Independent* Congregations, as well plead their Baptiſm, for their continuing in that way of Worſhip, which was in the Church, wherein they were baptized? Or would you have ſuch Re-baptized? Or can you prove, that unleſs Men renounce their Baptiſm, they muſt needs own *Dioceſan* Churches, and the Pariſh-Miniſter (howſoever unqualified) whom the Biſhop ſets over them?

You that could find out a *Mean betwixt Tyranny over Mens Consciences, and endless Separation*, to wit, a prudent and due *Submission in lawful things*, (as *pag.* 208.) me-thinks it is a little strange, you could think of *no Mean betwixt* tying People to their Parish Minister (though notoriously unfit for the Ministry,) and suffering them to run after *Quakers*, or *Papists*, p. 330. I suppose you approve of that Saying of the Bishops you cite, *pag.* 320. "If he (that was chosen) were worthy, they would consecrate him, but "not otherwise. So you would not have Bishops obliged, or forced to *consecrate the unworthy*, neither surely should they *ordain* such, or grant Institution and Induction to such: Yet I see not, but you would have *People obliged* to accept of them, if instituted and inducted, though it be never so apparent, and easie to prove, they are unworthy. It would seem, it is *enough* with you, that *we have the same Religion*, (publickly professed) *pag.* 208. Though some in place are never so great a scandal to Religion, great Enemies to it, whose Ministry *tends to do more harm, than good*, p. 123.

11. Are you *Impartial?* or rather, are you not *uncharitable* in your Censure of all those, whom you condemn as Separatists, and guilty of Schism? As you say to the Romanist, *Rational Account*, pag. 613. §. 3. *You expresly grant a possibility of Salvation,—— in case of invincible Ignorance; and dare you deny it, where there is a preparation of Mind to find out, and embrace the most certain way to Heaven; where all Endeavours are used to that end, and where there is a consciencious Obedience to the Will of God, so far as it is discovered:* So say I to you. But here, do not in Effect charge them, with *not using the best means for a right Information?* otherwise you say their *Non-communion in the Particulars scrupled, may be excused*, (p. 73. f.) Therefore say I, their *Non-communion* with you (who yet acknowledg you to be true Churches) cannot be the most *inexcusable*, unless you suppose them to be the most deficient in using the means for right Information. Do you not charge them with *wilful Error or Mistake?* p. 373. "There must be wil-"fulness in the Error or Mistake which doth not excuse. For I say ex-"spresly, if the Error be wholly involuntary, it does excuse. So you suppose, *pag.* 140. "That the terms of Communion are only fancied to "be sinful through prejudice, or wilful Ignorance, or Error of Conscience. Where we must understand, you would have [*wilful*] joyned to each of these, otherwise it would excuse. And you add, *pag.* 141. "It is to be "supposed, that where there is no plain Prohibition, Men may with or-"dinary Care and Judgment, satisfy themselves of the Lawfulness of "things required. Therefore you suppose that all who are not so satisfied, are Men that want both ordinary Care and Judgment, who *suffer themselves to be so easily deluded*, p. 142. f. Here I meet with a *Letter* of some old

suffering

623

ſuffering *Non-conformiſts*, (being an *Anſwer* to what a Reverend Conformable Divine had written to them.) Some Paſſages therein I ſhall tranſcribe, (ſuppoſing it was never printed, that they may be new to you, though written many Years ſince.)

——*The ſecond Courſe you direct us to, of ſeeking Information* [*but with all Humility, and Prayer in the uſe of means (but with all Indifferency) leſt halting with God, as* Balaam *did, we find his ſucceſs*) *we readily accept it, according to the meaſure of the Truth and Integrity of our Hearts; only we have cauſe to be humbled, and fear our own Hearts (for we ſpeak of our ſelves, we judge not others) leſt any of us yield without ſuch ſerious ſearch after the Truth, as you adviſe, and that for fear of loſing what* Balaam *gained. For ought we ſee, there is ſmall hopes of gaining* Balaam's *ways by ſtanding for the Purity of God's Ordinances, and therefore leſs Fear of halting as* Balaam *did, in ſeeking and following after that way, which expoſeth us to the leaſt of all the chiefeſt Comforts of this Life, and which if it be not the way of Truth, we are of all true-hearted Engliſh-men the moſt miſerable.* And further on, they ſay,—— *Or ſuppoſe (which God forbid) that we were ſo void of Chriſtianity and Humanity together, as to undo our ſelves (inward and outward Man, without all Reaſon or Conſcience;) yet will you paſs the ſame Judgment upon all thoſe three hundred Miniſters, which in our memories have been deprived for that very Cauſe, for which we ſuffer? Were not ſome of them ſuch, as the Chriſtian World never yielded more eminent Lights of Sincerity and true Holineſs, ſince the Apoſtles times? And did Miſpriſion, or long Uſe make ſuch a fell adoe in their Hearts alſo, as to blind their Conſciences in this Cauſe? Was all their Patience in this Cauſe for Conſcience ſake, not a Fruit of God's Spirit in them, but a Baſtard of their own Spirit?* (And Sir, you may be informed, how ſome of them ſuffered for *Preaching* and *keeping Conventicles*, as they were called, as well as for *In-conformity*.) Afterwards towards the Concluſion, they have theſe words, *Conſider whether you rightly take ſuch things for indifferent, when they do not ſuffer you to carry an indifferent Mind towards your poor Brethren, which in them only, and in no weightier Matters, do differ from you.* And let me beg of you to conſider it; and once more to conſider your own words, *Rational Account*, p. 614. "But we have not ſo learned "Chriſt, we dare not deal ſo inhumanly with them in this World, much "leſs judg ſo uncharitably as to another, of thoſe who profeſs to fear "God, and work Righteouſneſs, though they be not of the ſame Opi-"nion or Communion with us. Remember this, unleſs you will retract it.

The laſt point of *Partiality* I ſhall take notice of, toucheth me in particular, *Preface* p. 61, 62. You ſay of that *worthy Perſon*, (whoſoever he was) who wrote *the Letter out of the Country*, "He ſeems to write like a "well-

" well-disposed Gentleman, —— He discourses gravely and piously, without " Bitterness and Rancor, or any sharper Reflections, &c. Though he also reflects on your *Irenicum*, yet there is *no harm done*. You have the same from him as it were by *whole-sale*, (almost two Pages together, *Letter*, p. 15, 16.) which I *return in small Parcels*; yet do you not *pay Him off* with such sharp *Invectives*, as I have from you, *Preface* p. 72.

So now I come to consider what you say to me, *Preface* p. 71. " The " whole Design of that Book doth not seem very agreeable to the Christi- " an-temper which the Author pretends to. Whether is it your meaning, that it is *not wholly agreeable*, or *not at all agreeable*? Whether, not agreeable in all things, or agreeable in nothing? But is it not for *Moderation* in such Cases, wherein Moderation ought to be shewn? And is not that *very agreeable to the Christian-temper*? And what may others say now of your *Irenicum*? If what I transcribed thence, seem to you *not agreeable to the Christian temper*, then, was you not under some great Distemper, either at the writing of this latter, or that former Book? In the *Christian-temper* I have Occasion (*p.* 370.) to borrow something from Bishop *Downam*; what he noteth to have always been the *Hypocrites Guise*, I there say is the *genius of false Zeal*, Scil. *To neglect the greater Duties, and to affect the Observation of the less; to prefer Circumstances before the Substance, and Ceremonies before the Works, either of Piety or Charity; to place the heighth of their Religion, either in observing, or urging Ceremonies, or Controversies, in inveighing against them.* And I say further, (*p.* 371.) *You would not take him for a wise and careful Builder, that laid the greatest Weight on the weakest part of the Wall.* —— *And is this true Zeal for God? Or rather is it not a selfish Zeal, which is for ones own Opinions (or own Party) neglecting those things, which make most for the Honour of God, and wherein the main Interest of Religion lieth.* If I could see any thing there, or in that Book, which chanceth to bear the Name of the *Rector of Sutton*, that is *not agreeable to the Christian-temper*, and to the Truth, and Doctrine of Christ, I hope I should be ready to retract the same.

*Ibid.* " For it is to pick up all the Passages he could meet with (in a " Book written twenty Years since) with great tenderness towards Dis- " senters, before the Laws were established.

And have you repented of that your former Kindness and Tenderness towards them, since the Laws were against them? But *Solomon* tells us, A *Friend loveth at all times, and a Brother is born for Adversity*. Which I observed to be *agreeable to the Christian-temper*, (p. 219.) And you cannot deny that which you told us twenty Years since, of the *Magistrates Power* being *bounded*. *He hath Power of determining things* (undetermined by the Word) *so they be agreeable to the Word.* —— *His Laws must be regulated by the general*

*Rules*

*Rules of the Divine Law*, (*Rector of Sutton*, p. 12.) That no Laws of Men can hinder, but what was *Truth*, will be *Truth* ſtill, and what was *Duty*, will be *Duty* ſtill.

In what followeth, you more *humbly*, (as it would ſeem) than *truly confeſs* (in Mr. *Cotton*'s words) the *weakneſs or unwarineſs of thoſe Expreſſions*, which I have gathered out of your *Irenicum*. That Book was your *Firſt-born*. And the *Firſt-born* was the *chief of their Strength*, Pſal. 105. 36. But it ſeems, you are for reading *Gen.* 49. 3. *Principium doloris*, rather than *Principium roboris*. The *beginning of your Strength*, is now become the *beginning of your Grief*. Thus you now let the World know indeed, that whereas you had written much, favouring the Cauſe of Diſſenters, your *Thoughts at laſt are changed*, as to thoſe *Things* and *Perſons* too.

Next you fall hotly on me, [ "And, have you not very well requited "the Author of that Book, for the Tenderneſs and Pitty he had for you, "and the Concernment he then expreſſed, to have brought you upon eaſier "Terms, &c.]

*Reverend Sir*, I hope you will give me leave to ſpeak, when I am thus ſpoken to. I ſuppoſe you expect my Anſwer, when you put Queſtions ſo cloſe to me. Firſt then, I thank you for your *good pains* taken in that Book, and for your *truly Chriſtian Deſign* in it, *ſo agreeable to the Chriſtian-temper*; though it hath been unſucceſful. I doubt not yet, but that Book will *ſtand as a Witneſs* before God and the World againſt many, who can never anſwer that Strength of Reaſon in it, an Evidence of Truth, againſt unneceſſary, rigorous, *miſchievous Impoſitions*; and yet were for preſſing, and are ſtill for continuing them upon us. But it is *no ill Requital* of the Author, that I have an eſteem of his Work. And if you can reconcile the *Scope of your Sermon* with what I cite out of your former Writings, do your ſelf that Right. Or if you can, refute thoſe *Collections*; otherwiſe ſuch as meet with them may be tempted to think you *ſelf-condemned*.

When you ſay, you *wrote in Tenderneſs*, &c. I hope, you did not only play the Orator, make a flouriſh meerly with Words; or plead our Cauſe againſt your own Judgment; nor acted the part of Politician, as hoping to engage a Party; but wrote your Judgment, as a ſober (and indeed *well ſtudied*) *Divine*. Will you ſay, you *wrote partially* then, as *ſwayed* with your *Pitty* and *Tenderneſs* towards Diſſenters? How then ſhall we be ſatisfied, and aſſured, that you have not *written partially* of late, out of overmuch *Fondneſs* on Conformity? If you wrote *impartially*, your Judgment, and Reaſon deſerves to be regarded, till you, or ſome other for you, bring greater Strength of Reaſon to prove you was then in an Error. You *pleaded* well for *eaſier Terms*, and what can you ſay now, what have you thought

thought of since to *justify Mens imposing harder Terms?* How can you answer your own Interrogatories, [*What ground can there be, why Christians should not stand upon the same Terms now, which they did in the time of Christ and his Apostles?* And, *whether do they consult the Churches Peace and Unity, who suspend it upon such things,* (as you know what?) *How far doth the Example of our Saviour or his Apostles warrant such rigorous Impositions?*] Rector of Sutton, *pag.* 7, 8.

You express your having been *concerned to have brought us in,*—But were not many of *us in,* both *in the Church,* and *in the Ministry,* before we were *put out* by the late Impositions? By this expression of yours, it would seem, your Church is *a new Church, lately erected,* standing upon *new Terms,* (which I shall have occasion again to take notice of.) But were we not true Ministers before? had we not a *valid Ordination? Deny it if you can.* And if we were true Ministers before, then it is a *great Question,* whether we are not so still, (unless you can prove we were *justly degraded.*) And consequently, whether we are not *obliged to the exercise of our Ministry,* as we may have opportunity? *Preface* p. 72. 'And hath he now 'deserved this at your hands, to have them all thrown down in his 'Face, and to be thus upbraided with his former Kindness? 'Is this your 'Ingenuity, your Gratitude, your Christian-temper?

Now are not these pretty *sharp Reflections?* If you can justly charge me with any *Bitterness and Rancor,* &c. I shall acknowledg such things not *agreeable to the Christian-temper,* and would be ashamed of them. If you are ashamed to own your former Principles, many will judg, it is without Cause. It may prove your *fallen from those sober Principles,* but it will not *prove those Principles false.*

When you speak of *my throwing them in your Face,* my Design was not to *cast Dirt* upon so worthy a Person. What I alledged, I took to be *matter of Argument,* and with this Advantage, *ad Hominem.* I know no Reason you have to be sorry for what you wrote formerly, *tending to Peace and Union,* as you may have cause to be sorry for what looks another way. I should have thought, the *Method* I took (minding you how much you had *said against such an established Rule,* as you would now bring us under) might have tended to *moderate,* rather than *exasperate* you. What if you have since changed your Opinion? Yet me-thinks, you should not judge *those former Principles of yours* so sinful and dangerous, that none are fit to be *tolerated in the Church* who hold to them. How happy and *glorious* would the *Church of England* be, had she *no worse Teachers, than Dr. Stillingfleet* was, when he maintained those Principles? Or if you do account them so sinful and dangerous, are you not the more *obliged to disprove* and refute them? which you will find *as hard a Task,* as it would have been

to

to *Grotius*, had he gone about the *Confutation* of what he had written *de ſatisfactione Chriſti.*

You go on, "Are you afraid of having too many Friends, that you "thus uſe thoſe, whom you once took to be ſuch? Me-thinks hercin you "appear very ſelf-denying.

I am not careful to anſwer in this matter. But is it ſo, that we have quite loſt you? Will you no more ſtand our Friend? *Where is then the Kindneſs you ſpake of?* I remember, Dr. *Borrel* ſilenced me, when I had been ſilenced not two Months before: But I could not have thought 20 Years ago, that when we were driven into Corners, Dr. *St.* would be *for driving us out of our Corners* too, even he that could plead ſo well for us, that we might enjoy publick Liberty. Here I look back to that (*Preface*, p. 52.) "They would have had me preached for Alterations and Abatements, "and taking away Ceremonies and Subſcriptions,—— and then I might "have been thought to have preached a very ſeaſonable Sermon. This indeed would have ſhewed, that you was ſtill our Friend, and not ours only, but as good a Friend to this poor Church and Kingdom. To plead for *all Abatements* that (*with the Honour of God*, and *ſafety of true Religion*) might be granted to Diſſenters, for the uniting and ſtrengthening of the Proteſtant Intereſt, in ſuch danger to be trodden down by the common Enemy, would certainly be *more ſeaſonable*, than this work you are engaged in.

I would know, whether that Speech of the *Biſhop of St. David's* in the Convocation-Houſe, *May* 23, 1604, was not ſeaſonable? Can it ever be unſeaſonable, moving for the due Liberty of grave, honeſt, ſound, and conſcientious Men, ſuch as the Church hath need of at all times, and whoſe Labours might be very profitable? And then, whether *pleading for Abatements* at this day be not as ſeaſonable? *I put a great difference* (ſaid he) *between Quid liceat*, and *Quid expediat*,——And then ſpeaking of thoſe who were ſcrupulous only upon ſome Ceremonies, and other Circumſtances, being otherwiſe *learned, ſtudious, grave and honeſt Men, whoſe Labours have been both painful in the Church, and profitable to their ſeveral Congregations*, (he ſays) *though I do not juſtify their Doings, yet ſurely their Service would be miſſed, at ſuch time as need ſhall require them, and us to give the right hand of Fellowſhip one to another, and to go arm in arm againſt the common Adverſary, that ſo there might be* vis unita fortior.—— *If theſe our Brethren aforeſaid ſhould be deprived of their places for the matters premiſed, I think we ſhould find Cauſe to bend our Wits to the uttermoſt extent of our Skill to provide ſome cure of Souls for them, where they may exerciſe their Talents.*

*Furthermore, If theſe Men, being divers hundreds (as it is bruited abroad) ſhould forſake their Charges (as ſome do preſuppoſe they will) who I pray you*

*ſhould ſucceed them.* —— *Beſides this, for ſo much as in the Life-time of the late Arch-Biſhop of* Canterbury, *theſe things were not ſo extreamly urged, but that many learned Preachers enjoyed their Liberty herein, conditionally that they did not by Word or Deed openly diſgrace, or diſturb the State eſtabliſhed; I would know a Reaſon, why it ſhould now be ſo generally and exceeding ſtrictly called upon, eſpecially ſeeing that thoſe Men are now the more neceſſary, by ſo much as we ſee greater Increaſe of Papiſts to be now of late, than were before. To conclude, I wiſh, that if by Petition made to the King's Majeſty, there cannot be obtained a quite remove of the Premiſes, which ſeem ſo grievous to divers, nor yet a Toleration for them, which be of the more ſtaid, and temperate Carriage; yet at the leaſt, there might be procured a Mitigation of the Penalty, if they cannot be drawn by other Reaſons to a Conformity with us.* Thus the *Biſhop of St. David's.* And if all the Biſhops in *England* were of his Mind, and would move for their Miniſterial Liberty, whoſe Service is needful, at ſuch a time as this eſpecially, whether would it not be very ſeaſonable? And if you had a Kindneſs, and Pity for Diſſenters, is there not the ſame Reaſon for it ſtill? And is not *this very Juncture of Time* as good an Occaſion, as ever you may have to ſhew it?

You ſay further to me, *Preface* p. 72. "But I cannot take you to be any "of the wiſeſt Men upon Earth.] And I ſhould wonder if you did. But you know what *Diogenes* ſaid to one that told him, *many mocked him. But* (ſaid he) *I am not mocked.* I might well expect your Contempt, when I ſee you contemning ſuch, whoſe Books I am not worthy to carry after them. Yet it may be queſtioned here, whether you take not your ſelf to be wiſer, than *the Wiſdome of the whole Nation in Parliament*, comparing your *Preface* p. 81, *&c.* with the declared Senſe of that great and honorable Council? *Pref.* p. 93. you ſay, "Theſe are all the things which appear to "me reaſonable to be allowed in order to an Union. So that if they were inclined to have gone further, therein they appeared to you not very conſiderate, or reaſonable.

"When you think it reaſonable, that upon longer time, and farther Con- "ſideration, thoſe Divines of the Aſſembly, who then oppoſed Separati- "on, ſhould change their Opinions: [But where find you this in what I wrote] "Will you not allow one ſingle Perſon (but *ſtupendæ eruditionis Theologum*, as the Latine Apologiſt then called you, *pag.* 118.) "Who "happened to write about theſe matters when he was very young; (as you may ſay, Mr. *Joſeph Alleyn* was very young, when he was very ripe) "in twenty Years time of the moſt buſie and thoughtful part of his Life, "to ſee Reaſon to alter his Judgment? And yet you was as cloſe a Student in that former part of your Life, and as free from other Buſineſs, from Diverſions, and Temptations, as can be ſuppoſed you have been ſince.

But

But you ſhould be *allowed to alter your Judgment*, and none can blame you, if it be *for the better*. Only in this caſe, you ſhould be ſo juſt, and charitable, as to let us know your Reaſons, that if they be ſound, we may *ſee Cauſe to alter ours*. I hope, you will not ſay, "Then was then, and "now is now. And can you now aſſure us, that you ſhall not alter your preſent Judgment once again within twenty Years? We read of Biſhops that have cried *peccavimus* again and again, and of Councils doing and undoing again, and ſometimes in leſs than twenty Years.

"But after all this, wherein is it that he hath thus contradicted himſelf? "Is it in the point of Separation, which is the preſent Buſineſs? No, ſo "far from it, that in that very Book, he ſpeaks as fully concerning the "Unlawfulneſs of Separation, as in this Sermon, which will appear by "theſe Particulars in it.

If by *Separation*, you mean a Separation from any Church *upon any ſlight, trivial, unneceſſary Cauſe*, as you define Schiſm, *Irenic.* p. 113. I am not for ſuch a Separation. But perhaps ſome may tell you, that if you ſeparate from ſuch Aſſemblies as Mr. *B. &c.* when you might have *occaſional Communion* with them, you do it *upon far leſs Cauſe*, than many ſeparate from thoſe of yours, where they are required to joyn in Practices more to be ſuſpected.

If by *Separation* you mean any aſſembling for the Worſhip of God, *otherwiſe than according to your eſtablaiſht Rule*; and ſo condemn the Aſſemblies of meer *Non-conformiſts*, that are not of Schiſmatical Principles; yea, even their occaſional Meetings, and thoſe kept off from the times of publick Worſhip in the Parochial Congregations, I doubt not but the Lawfulneſs of ſuch Aſſemblies is, and ſhall be evidently proved from that Book.

*Preface* p. 72, 73. Which will appear by theſe Particulars in it.

(1.) *Irenic.* p. 123. "That it is unlawful to ſet up new Churches, becauſe "they cannot conform to ſuch Practices which they ſuſpect to be unlawful.

(2.) "Thoſe are new Churches, when men erect diſtinct Societies for "Worſhip, under diſtinct and peculiar Officers, governing by Laws, and "Church-Rules, different from that Form they ſeparate from.

(3.) *P.* 124. "As to things in the Judgment of the Primtive and Reform-"ed Churches left undetermined by the Laws of God, and in matters of "meer Order and Decency, and wholly as to the Form of Government, "every one, notwithſtanding what his private Judgment may be of them, "is bound for the Peace of the Church of God, to ſubmit to the Determi-"nation of the Church. Allow but theſe three Concluſions, and defend "the preſent Separation if you can.

620



*Ad Trianos ventum eſt*, I hope now we ſhall come to ſomething. Me-thinks, we have been too long beating about the Buſh. And yet I am kept off a while, ſeeing you taking up a good part of two Pages to no purpoſe; unleſs it be to perſwade your Readers, that I was unwilling to take notice of that, which you cannot but grant I do take notice of, *viz.* that *you diſtinguiſh betwixt Non-communion in unlawful, or ſuſpected Rites or Practices in a Church and entring into diſtinct Societies for Worſhip.* And it were ſtrange, if I had over-look'd, or was unwilling, the Readers ſhould ſee *theſe Concluſions* of yours, when you cannot but ſay, I there cite the very Pages, *Rector of Sutton* p. 30. And I can ſay, I gave them what I thought might *ſeem material.* They will find but two Concluſions in *Irenicum*; your *ſecond Concluſion* here is there but an *Explication* of the firſt. And what I granted you, *is all you can make of them*, to your purpoſe here. And did I not acknowledg, again and again there, that the *Primitive* and *Reformed Churches* were two of your *Judges?* And what Advantage you will get by that, or any of theſe Concluſions, we ſhall now ſee. Me-thinks, I have this Advantage that you here *own theſe three Concluſions.* When you would have me to allow them; it is to be ſuppoſed, that you allow them your ſelf. Yea, you ſay of them, *Theſe are moſt pertinent and material.* Therefore I ſhall go over them again.

*Concluſion* 1. "That it is unlawful to ſet up new Churches, becauſe they "cannot conform to ſuch Practices, which they ſuſpect to be unlaw-"full.

Here, 1. I urge you with what you ſay, *Irenic.* p. 117. "Withdrawing "Communion from a Church in unlawful or ſuſpected Things, doth not "lay Men under the Guilt of Schiſm. You ſay, Men may lawfully deny "Communion with a Church in ſuch things. I ſay, Men cannot lawfully have Communion in ſuch things. As *King James*, (on the Lord's Prayer, *pag.* 44.) *It is a good and ſure Rule in Theology, in matters of God's Worſhip*, quod dubitas nè feceris. So *Hales* (Miſcel. of Schiſm, *p.* 210.) *Not only in Reaſon, but in Religion too, that Maxim admits of no Releaſe*, Cautiſſimi cujuſq; præceptum, quod dubitas nè feceris. And Mr. R. *Hooker*, (*Preface* to his *Eccleſ. Polit. §.* 6.) *Not that I judg it a thing allowable for Men to obſerve thoſe Laws, which in their Hearts they are ſtedfaſtly perſwaded to be againſt the Law of God.* What he ſays further there, of Men being bound to *ſuſpend their Perſwaſion* in matters determined by Governours, which they have not demonſtrative Reaſons againſt, you very well take off. *Irenic. p.* 118, 119. "No true Proteſtant can ſwear blind Obedience "to Church-Governours, *&c.* And certainly, it is neither in a Mans Power to ſuſpend his own Perſwaſion, or lay aſide his Doubts *ad libitum*, nor is he allowed to act againſt his own Judgment and Conſcience

(though

621

(though miſ-informed.) That Man ſinneth without doubt, who ventureth on Practices he ſuſpects to be ſinful (though in themſelves the Practices be lawful.) What the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom* 14. 5,14,23. puts the matter out of diſpute.

Now to joyn in *Common-Prayer* is an unlawful, or ſuſpected Practice to ſome. They take it to be polluted with Superſtition. Perhaps they take Communion herein to be a ſinful Symbolizing with the Papiſts, for what *King Edward 6*, and *King James* ſaid of it. And if you ſhould tell them our Service-book is reformed; it is poſſible, ſome may now reply, How can you ſay ſo? Will you *blaſt the Credit* of, and caſt a Reproach upon our *firſt Reformers?* Again, baptizing with the *Sign of the Croſs*, and *kneeling* in the Act of receiving the Sacrament, (as it were before the Sacramental Elements) are ſuſpected unlawful Practices to many. And thus they are *barred from Communion* with you in Sacraments. And therefore you had no Reaſon to ſlight others modeſt Expreſſions here, as you do, *pag.* 333. [*They judg, they think, they eſteem them unlawful, and they cannot be ſatisfied about them.*] Though you are far ſhort of anſwering all that hath been ſaid to prove ſome things enjoyned unlawful; yet ſuppoſe a Man ignorant, erring and miſtaken here (not without Fault) notwithſtanding he muſt *ſuſpend his own Act* till he be better informed, and ſatisfied about it. And here I would again mind you of thoſe ſignificant Expreſſions, *Irenic. pag.* 119. "Let Men turn and wind themſelves which way they will, by "the very ſame Arguments that any will prove Separation from the Church "of *Rome* lawful, becauſe ſhe required unlawful Things, as Conditions of "her Communion, it will be proved lawful not to conform to any ſuſ-"pected or unlawful Practice required by any Church-Governours upon "the ſame Terms, if the Thing ſo required, be after ſerious and ſober "Enquiry, judged unwarrantable by a Man's own Conſcience. Which (with more you have in that Page, and the Page before it) cuts off your third Particular, *Preface* p. 75. Here now I have gained ſo much Ground of you. Such are neceſſitated to withdraw from your Communion, who muſt otherwiſe *joyn in ſome unlawful or ſuſpected Practice.* As *Chillingworth*, p. 269. *To do ill that you may do well, is againſt the Will of God, which to every good Man is a high Degree of Neceſſity.* And ſay you, *Rational Account*, p. 290. "Can any one imagine it ſhould be a Fault in any to keep off from "Communion, where they are ſo far from being obliged to it, that they "have an Obligation to the contrary, from the Principles of their com-"mon Chriſtianity. Here I aſſume, they are bound by the *Principles of common Chriſtianity* to keep off from Communion with you, that know they ſhould certainly ſin, if they held Communion with you, becauſe they ſhould then joyn in ſuſpected Practices, and things, which after Enquiry, their Conſciences tell them are unlawful. Ergo,

622



*Ergo*, you must say, it cannot be *a Fault* in such to keep off from Communion with you. Though I would grant them *faulty so far* as any keep off through Prejudice, Error, Ignorance; yet so far as these are *involuntary*, they are *more excusable*, than to go directly cross to their own Consciences here. So therefore such *are necessitated* to withdraw Communion from you, who would certainly sin, if they held Commuion with you, judging such Communion to be sinful.

2. If you say here, What is this to a *positive Separation*, which is the present Business? You shall see, it is something towards it. You are *come a fair Step* on the Way. Once grant that it is lawful for Men (or that Men are necessitated) to deny Communion with you in *unlawful*, *or* (but) *suspected Practices*, which are unlawful to them, and you come presently to the Point. Allowing them to withdraw from yours, you must allow them to joyn in some other Christian Assembly; unless you would have them utterly deprived of the Worship of God, and to live like Heathens: As you say well, *Irenic. p.* 109. "Every Christian is under an Obligation to joyn in Church society with others; because it is "his Duty to profess himself a Christian, and to own his Religion publickly, and to partake of the Ordinances and Sacraments of the Gospel, "which cannot be without Society with some Church or other. So then, Christians that cannot enjoy Sacraments with you, must joyn with some other Society, where they may enjoy them. And further, take notice of that *remarkable Assertion*, in your *Rational Account*, p. 335. and apply it here, as far as there is Cause, "Our Assertion therefore is, that the Church "and Court of *Rome* are guilty of this Schism,—— by forcing Men (*N.B.*) "if they would not damn their Souls by sinning against their Consciences, "in approving the Errors and Corruptions of the *Roman* Church, to joyn "together (*N. B.*) for the solemn Worship of God, according to the "Rule of Scripture, and Practice of the Primitive Church, and suspending (I suppose it should have been, *and to suspend*) Communion with "that Church till those Abuses and Corruptions be redressed. And I observe further, *Ibid. p.* 291. you would not have Men *bound to Communion with a particular Church*, but in Subordination to *God's Honour*, and the *Salvation of their Souls*. Yea, you say, Men are *bound not to communicate in those lesser Societies*, where such things are imposed, as *are directly repugnant* to these Ends. And where Men should be *forced to damn their Souls by sinning against their Consciences*, would not this *be directly repugnant?* And yet are not such bound to joyn together for the Solemn Worship of God, *&c.* You see now *how far I have brought you*, even *on your own Grounds*: how you will *get off*, I know not.

Then

Then might it not have been expected, that you would have been more favourable, and charitable towards the Aſſemblies of thoſe Miniſters and Chriſtians, that are kept off from you by *unlawful Terms*, or at leaſt ſuch *unneceſſary Terms* as are *to them unlawful?* You ſpeak more temperately, *Rational Account*, pag. 331. Here let me uſe ſome of your own Words there, which ſomething favour thoſe Aſſemblies, you now engage ſo zealouſly againſt, *By their declaring the Grounds of their Separation to be ſuch Errors and Corruptions, which are crept into the Communion of your Church, and impoſed on them in order to it, they withal declare their readineſs to joyn with you again, if thoſe Errors and Corruptions be left out.* ☞ 'And where 'there is this readineſs of Communion, there is no abſolute Separation 'from the Church as ſuch, but only ſuſpending Communion till ſuch 'Abuſes be reformed. This they'l ſay is very good. But now in your new *Impartial Account*, *Preface* pag. 46. you ſpeak in another Dialect, 'Would they have had me repreſented that as no Sin, which I think to 'be ſo great a one; or thoſe as not guilty, whom in my Conſcience I 'thought to be guilty of it? Would they have had me ſuffered this Sin 'to have lain upon them without reproving it? *&c.* (What? that which is *as plain a Sin as Murder*, pag. 209. which is *really as great and as dangerous a Sin, as Murder; and in ſome reſpects aggravated beyond it*, Preface p. 45.) And yet on the other hand, would you have them conform to you, though *againſt their Conſciences?* Would that be *no Sin?* Would God be well-pleaſed with ſuch Service, as was done but to pleaſe Men, while their Conſciences (in the mean while) condemned them for it? Can you ſay *bonâ Fide*, that it is better, more pleaſing to God, that Men *conform to your Modes and Ceremonies*, though they have *real Doubts* of Conſcience, that they are unlawful; or better, they ſhould *live without God's publick Worſhip* and Ordinances, then to joyn with ſuch as the *Non-conformiſts?* That this is *as the Sin of Murder!* Dare you go, or ſend to all the Diſſenters in your Pariſh (ſuppoſing you take them to belong to your Charge) and give 'm it under your hand, that though they are ſtill unſatisfied, (after all you have ſaid and written) though they believe, they ſhould offend God, if they joyned with you upon ſuch Terms; yet I ſay, durſt you give it under your hand, that they would *do better to joyn in your way of Worſhip*, than in that of the *Non-conformiſts*; though they have no more doubt of joyning with the latter, than you had heretofore? If you are clear in the Point, have you done this? Or why do you neglect your Duty towards them? Why do you not endeavour to bring them in, or *lay the Sin at their Door?* But I obſerve, you would have Care taken, (*Preface* p. 86.) that there be 'No Pretence left for idle, looſe, and 'profane Perſons, never going to any Church at all; whence I conclude,

that

624



that you cannot but allow it, that such as are not satisfied to joyn with you, yet ought to joyn in God's Worship elsewhere: and that *in your serious Thoughts* you judg it better for Persons to joyn with *Congregations, that hold Communion in your way of Worship unlawful* (for *of such* you are speaking in that place) than to be of no Christian Society, than not to attend at all on God's Worship.

Here, if you would not be offended, I shall tell you, what a plain Christian, a Neighbour of mine, said of you; *I can remember, I have seen him at the Sacrament with some of you,* (above 20 Years ago) *and would he now have poor, hungry Souls deprived of such Ordinances and Means of Grace, that cannot be satisfied to partake of them in his Way? If any were a Cause of depriving so many thousands of their bodily Food, as he would have deprived of Food for their Souls, what would the World say of such?* Whereby he seemed to think *your Sin as great, as Murder, and in some respects, aggravated beyond it.* (As he may likewise think, the Sin of those that care not *unnecessarily to offend* others, or would cause them to offend, to be *a kind of Murder*, in the Apostles Account, *Rom.* 14. 15 —— *Now walkest thou not charitably? Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died.*) Such was the honest Man's Zeal, he would have written to you, to *put it to your Conscience*, (as he said) but I thought this Intimation from him sufficient.

3. I find you *so kind, or just*, you help such to *Ministers*, those that cannot conform. *Irenic. p.* 42, you say, *It belongs to the Magistrate*, 'To 'see that Ministers preach the true Doctrine, though he cannot lawfully 'forbid the true Doctrine to be taught; and that they duly administer 'the Sacraments, though he cannot command them to administer them 'otherwise than Christ hath delivered them down to us. (And that *Christ did not deliver the Sign of the Cross down to us with Baptism*, I suppose the highest Conformists will grant.) This gives some Hopes, such may *lawfully preach* still, whom others cannot *lawfully forbid Preaching*. And you tell us from another (*Unreasonableness of Separation*, pag. 7.) that '*Cranmer* 'held himself for a Arch-Bishop still, and was by Q. *Marry* forcibly restrained 'from it.—— *Latimer* though he renounced his Bishoprick, yet he kept 'his Ministry, and never repented him of it. And *Ibid. p.* 132. you say, 'The Question is not, whether all publick Worship be sinful, when forbid-'den? (which you *never said, or thought*, as you tell us in the same Page) —'I abhor and detest such Principles, as to set up Man's Laws above God's. This is good. And you seem to allow, that *such publick Worship, as hath no Evil in it, antecedent to the Prohibition, may not be forbidden.* Very good still. All the Question here is, *Whether there be not Schism in it?* For I hope, you shall never find *Idolatry or Sedition* in that Worship, I would plead

plead for. Now as for the Charge of *Schiſm*, do but *allow Miniſters equal Favour* with others, and you have ſaid enough to clear them, *Iren.* p. 113, 116, 119, 120. Charge not them with *Schiſm* upon account of their diſtinct Meetings, who are *driven into them* by your over-rigorours Impoſitions. You know well how *great a matter* this *impoſing unlawful Conditions* is with *Chillingworth*, to warrant Separation. How oft he is upon it, in *Chap.* 5. where *p.* 267. §. 40. he hath the confidence to tell his Adverſary, 'You miſtake 'in thinking that Proteſtants hold themſeves obliged not to communicate 'with you only, or principally by reaſon of your Errors and Corruptions. 'For the true Reaſon (according to my third Obſervation) is not ſo much 'becauſe you maintain Errors and Corruptions, as becauſe you impoſe 'them, &c. (like your pleading for *Non-conformiſts*, *Irenic.* p. 118.) So *Ball* of Separation, *pag.* 159. *The Lord needeth not Mans lie, neither doth he allow us to do Evil that Good may come thereof: And therefore I muſt not ſubſcribe to an Error againſt Conſcience, though never ſo innocent, nor profeſs Approbation of that which in Conſcience I cannot allow, though never ſo ſmall*, &c. But thus are many Miniſters driven from you, who neither *dare lay down their Miniſtry*, nor *take the charge of Parochial Congregations* on them, upon ſuch hard, that is, *ſinful Terms*. For (to borrow an Expreſſion of Dr. *Potter's*) *Though in the iſſue the Errors be not damnable to them, which believe as they profeſs, yet for us to profeſs*, &c. *what we believe not, were without queſtion damnable.*

Now may I come in with *my Concluſion*: It is this.

*Concluſion* 1. It becomes *unavoidably neceſſary* for ſuch Miniſters and Chriſtians as *cannot in Conſcience ſubmit to your Terms*, and conform to your way of Worſhip, neither may *lawfully* lay aſide their Miniſtry, nor live without God's Worſhip and Ordinances, to be for *other Aſſemblies* than yours, where the one may exerciſe their Miniſtry, and the other (with ſuch Miniſters) may partake of God's Ordinances, and joyn in his Worſhip, which you call *ſetting up of new Churches*. After the drawing up of this, looking into *Corbet* of Church-Unity and Schiſm, I find ſomething to this purpoſe, *pag.* 31, 32. Though indeed I *took my Hints* from you here.

Now becauſe I would not leave this Propoſition ſo naked, as yours ſtands, I ſhall here offer ſomething, 1. On the behalf of Miniſters. 2. On the behalf of private Chriſtians

I. On the behalf of ſuch Miniſters.

1. You cannot deny, but the Miniſters, who are *forced to ſtand off* from you, were (at leaſt very many of them) *duly qualified* for, and had a ſufficient, *valid call* to the Office of the Miniſtry, that they were *God's Miniſters*, *Chriſt's Miniſters*, before their Ejection. You cannot deny, but the *mediate Call* is from God, and Chriſt, even as well as the *immediate*

*Call* was. Thoſe two Texts, *Act.*20.28. 1 *Cor.*12.28. (to name no more) fully prove it.

2. Though it is not queſtioned by us, but the *Clergy* is *under the Juriſdiction of the Prince*, Miniſters (as well as others) under the Civil Magiſtrate, and that they may (*where there is juſt Cauſe*) by him be deprived of their publick Liberty, and may be impriſoned, baniſhed, put to death; yet *without juſt Cauſe* (as *Male-adminiſtration, or matter of Scandal, rendring them unfit*, to uſe your own Words) no Power on Earth (whether Civil or Eccleſiaſtical) may turn thoſe out of the Miniſtry, whom God hath called to it. Rulers, Biſhops may neither put in, nor put out of this Office, as they liſt. Men may neither admit into, nor put from the Miniſtry, meerly at their their own Pleaſure, but only *according to Chriſt's Will* and *Appointment*. For his Officers and Servants they are. And Chriſt hath, by his Apoſtles (whoſe Authority is certainly Superior to that of the greateſt Biſhops and Councils that ever were) *deſcribed the Office*, and how Perſons are to be qualified for it. And when ſuch have been called to the Office, while they give *no juſt Cauſe* for Suſpenſion and Degradation, Chriſt looks on them as *his Miniſters* ſtill, and accordingly his Will is that Men own them *as ſuch*. And *they that deſpiſe them*, may therein (in a Degree) be *guilty of deſpiſing Chriſt*. *Chemnitius* (*Loc. com. par.* 3. p. 136. col. 1.) ſpeaks fully to the purpoſe, thus; *As God alone properly claims to himſelf the Right of Calling, even when the Call is mediate; ſo alſo properly it belongs to God to remove one from the Miniſtry. Therefore ſo long as God ſuffers in the Miniſtry his Servant teaching rightly, and living blameleſly*, Eccleſia non habet Poteſtatem alienum Servum amovendi, *The Church hath no Power (Authority) of putting away another's Servant. But when he no further edifies either by his Doctrine, or Life, but deſtroys the Church, then God himſelf removes him.*

3. If what you have ſaid formerly (remark'd in *Rector of Sutton*, p. 29.) hold true, (and you have not hitherto diſproved the ſame) then you muſt yield, the preſent *Non-conformiſt* Miniſters have not been *ſuſpended*, and caſt out *for any juſt Cauſe*. And may I not alſo add, If *Clement* ſay true, as you cite him here, (*Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, p. 314, 315.) 'Thoſe therefore who were appointed by them, or other eminent Men, 'the whole Church being therewith well-pleaſed, diſcharging their Office 'with Humility, Quietneſs, Readineſs, and Unblameableneſs, and being 'Men of a long time of good Report, we think ſuch Men cannot juſtly 'be caſt out of their Office. Though in the heat of Diſputation, your *Opinion ſeems* to be *changed of Perſons*, as well as *Things*; yet I hope in cool Blood you would not deny, but ſuch a Character agrees to many *Non-conformiſts*; that you ſhould think, they *cannot juſtly be caſt out of Office.*

627

*Office.* And I doubt not, but you are well acquainted with that *old Canon, That no Bishop or Priest should be taken into another's Place, if the former were blameless.*

4. If still they are in Office, as *Ministers of Christ*, are they not *obliged to serve* him in that Office, as they have a Call and Opportunity? (See again *Rector of Sutton*, pag. 29, 34, 75.) They must not *neglect the Gift* that is in them. Sad was the Doom of *the unprofitable Servant*, that buried his Talent! The *Teacher* must *wait on Teaching*. I suppose, all Christ's Ministers are concerned in that solemn Charge, 2. *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. And they are to *take heed to the Ministry*, which they have received; even though Men forbid them. You *abhor and detest such Principles, as to set Man's Laws above God's Laws*. And though they be threatned with Persecution for it; when they are *persecuted in one City*, they may *flee to another*, Mat. 10.23. Yet must they not *run away from their Work*, but be carrying that on in other Places, where they come, according to their Ability and Opportunity. *Prudence* directed them, *Joh.*20.19. to meet *privately* there, *at Evening*, keeping the *Door shut*, for fear of the Jews; yet meet they would. If Ministers be driven from their former Flocks, yet are they *Men in Office*, and preach as such, not only *as gifted Men*, in what other place soever God (by his Providence) calls them to bestow their Pains. They are Teachers *by Office*, to more than their proper Charges, even to as many as they have a Providential Call, *hic & nunc*, to preach unto.

So it appears, Men cannot *lawfully* silence Christ's Ministers, *without just Cause*; or if they do, that such Decree and Sentence does not oblige Conscience. I have it from Mr. *B. Church History*, p.446, 447. The *Dominican Inquisitor* that reasoned the matter with the *Bohemians*, would have silenced, excommunicated Priests bound to cease preaching: but *had the wit to add* [*if silenced for a reasonable Cause,*] and to confess, *Sententia injuste lata à suo judice, si Errorem inducat, vel Peccatum mortale afferet, nec timenda est, nec tenenda.* The old *Bohemian* Reformers held, (as *Ibid.* p.446.) *Every Priest and Deacon is bound to preach God's Word freely, or he sinneth mortally; and after Ordination he should not cease, no, not when excommunicated, because he must obey God rather than Man.* I see in *Carranza* (*fol.* 437.) It was one of the Articles, for which the *Council of Constance* sentenced *J. Wickliffe's* Bones to be digg'd up and burnt, (*Art.* 13.) *They that leave off to preach, or hear God's Word for Men's Excommunication, are excommunicate:* And you (that have greater store of Authors, and choice Books, then such as I must ever hope to have the Advantage of, you, I say) I doubt not have, what others add; they are excommunicate, *and in the day of Judgment shall be judged Traitors to Christ.* And these were among the

628



Articles, for which *J. Huſſe* was condemned, *Carranza*, fol. 440. *Art.* 17, 18. *A Prieſt of Chriſt living according to his Law, and having the Knowledg of the Scripture, and a working to edify the People, ought to preach notwithſtanding any pretended Excommunication.* And, *every one that comes to the Office of a Prieſt, hath a Command to preach, and ought to obey that Command, notwithſtanding Excommunication.* And theſe you know were before our oldeſt *Non-conformiſts*.

5. But now (Sir) that I may *come home* to you: If Miniſters were bound to ceaſe preaching, to lay aſide their Miniſtry, when ſilenced unjuſtly, then at *what a miſerable Loſs* might the Church be left? And if you could ſcarce ſatisfy your ſelves to ſee her at ſuch a loſs, we may very well hope, Chriſt would not have her left at ſuch a Loſs. His care of his Church (no doubt) is greater than yours would be.

Becauſe you ſeem not to take any notice of what I ſaid, (*Rect. of Sutton*, p. 28.) give me leave here to mind you of it again. What *a woful Caſe* the Church was in, if ſhe might be *deprived* of all, or the greateſt and ſoundeſt part of her Miniſters *at Man's pleaſure?* And further, *pag.* 43. I put a Caſe, ſhewing that if what you would have, be admitted, it might *fare a great deal the worſe* with the Church *under Orthodox* Biſhops, (and Governours) than if they were *grand Hereticks*. But to come to the Point I aim at: You know when almoſt two thouſand Miniſters were cut off from their publick Miniſterial Work (as it were) in one day, by a Law of Conformity. Now let us ſuppoſe the Minds of Rulers to change (which is not naturally impoſſible) and put the caſe that your *Conformity* ſhould be made *as great a Crime*, as *Non-conformity* hath been, and yet, 'the true Religion acknowledged, and the true Doctrine of Faith owned, (as you ſay here, *pag.* 148. §. 6.) Though I find Mr. *Phil. Nye*, (who is *a very conſiderable Perſon* with you, *Preface*, *p.* 27.) *In his Beams of Light*, pag. 192. ſaying, *Let the ſame Impoſitions and Penalties be put into the other Scale, againſt Epiſcopacy and Ceremonies: If the Law had ſaid, it ſhall be the loſs of a Man's living to practiſe or preach for Epiſcopacy, Common-Prayer-Book, or Ceremonies; theſe things even in their own Opinions would have been light as Vanity*, (p. 193.) Yet for what you ſay, *Preface*, p. 89. I am to ſuppoſe, he was under a miſtake. For we muſt *not think* (as you tell us there) 'that the Friends of the Church of *England* will be either afraid, or a-'ſhamed to own her Cauſe,—— or that you will give up the Cauſe of the 'Church,—— ſo as to condemn its Conſtitution, or make the Ceremo-'nies unlawful, which have been hitherto obſerved and practiſed in it. Now ſuppoſe ye were all *outed of your Livings*, becauſe ye could not, or would not *declare* your *Aſſent and Conſent to the utter aboliſhing* of ſuch things; I beſeech you, tell us ſincerely, what you would do in ſuch a Caſe,

and

and would have others of your Brethren to do? Do you judg it the *Duty of Paſtors* to go on in *paſſing a juſt Cenſure* (though *againſt the Will of the Magiſtrate*, as I urged you with it, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 76.) and yet would you *wholly lay aſide the Office of the Miniſtry*, and preach the Goſpel no more, rather than croſs his Will? Would ye think your ſelves no more concerned to endeavour to *keep up the Exerciſe of true Religion* (as you might) when it was *againſt the Will of the Magiſtrate?* If only ſuch as the *Non-conformiſts* were in place, you would be forced to confeſs, that, 'The true Religion was yet maintained and preached in publick 'Aſſemblies, (as *pag.* 136.) And that there was *an Agreement in all the 'Subſtantials of Religion*, between you and them; and therefore (according to your arguing, *pag.* 132.) you *could not exerciſe* (though more privately) when *turn'd out of your Livings*, but *ſuch Faults as Sedition, or Schiſm*, &c. would be found in your Meetings. *Make the Caſe* of Diſſenters *your own*, ſuppoſe your ſelves in the like Circumſtances, and I doubt not, you will ſee cauſe to judg more favourably of them. Do but allow them to do, as you would do your ſelves in the like Caſe, and I hope, this Diſpute will ſoon be at an End.

Here I ſhall take off all you ſay to that Queſtion I propoſed, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 26. 'And may it not be a Queſtion, whether they can properly 'be ſaid to erect New Churches, or to proceed to the forming of ſeparate 'Congregations, who were true Miniſters, and had their Congregations 'before others came into their places? If they had done nothing (*N. B.*) 'worthy of Ejection, or Excluſion from their Miniſtry, whether they have 'not ſtill a Right to exerciſe their Function? &c. You might have done well to have joyned my *Tenth Query* (pag. 3.) with it, and to have conſidered both together. But what ſay you to this? *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, p. 137. 'There is not one word in all this Plea, but might 'have equally ſerved the Papiſts in the beginning of the Reformation. How Sir! Are you in good earneſt? 'Not one word but might equally have 'ſerved the Papiſts? Why, certainly you wrote in haſte, and forgot your ſelf; or elſe it is your Judgment, that the *Popiſh Biſhops and Prieſts had done nothing worthy of Ejection, or Excluſion from their Offices*, that they had ſtill a Right to exerciſe their Functions. And yet you argue it, (*Rational Account*, pag. 379.) that they *were juſtly deprived*. How can theſe things ſtand together? 'They had done nothing worthy of Ejection, 'and yet were juſtly deprived. You ſeem to have a great Conceit of this *poor Shift*; we had it but a Page or two before, *pag.* 135. 'The Papiſts 'then had the very ſame Plea, that theſe Men have now. So you muſt ſay, and argue thus, *The Miniſters of Antichriſt* (and thoſe ſuch as were *State-Incendiaries* too) might *juſtly be caſt out by Law*; *ergo*, ſo may *true*

*Miniſters*

630



*Miniſters of Chriſt*, (though peaceable, and loyal.) I grant the Antecedent, but do you prove the Conſequent.

But what have you further to ſay to me? For indeed what you have yet ſaid here, is *worſe than nothing*. But in what follows, the Reader may think, you had a good mind to *pay me home*. 'For the Law ſignifies no-'thing with them in any Caſe, where themſelves are concerned. If 'Miniſters be ejected without or againſt Law, they who come into their 'places are no Uſurpers; and if they are caſt out by Law, they that ſuc-'ceed them are Uſurpers; ſo that the Law is always the leaſt thing in their 'Conſideration.

Now I thank you for this. But is there here *no ſharp Reflection?* Do you not here bewray *ſome undecent Paſſion*, which you ſo condemn others for? Are not theſe things *invidiouſly* ſpoken? Would you not here be *raking into old Sores*, &c. contrary to what you ſay in your *Preface*, p. 44, 45? But did you think to pinch me here, who never was in a *ſequeſtred Living*, nor my *predeceſſor before me*; but came in upon the choice of the People, none oppoſing? You thought to give us *a dry Blow* here, never conſidering that it would reach as many, if not more Conformiſts; though it could not once touch him, you ſeem eſpecially to direct it to.

But thus far of Miniſters exerciſing, though ſilenced, if ſilenced *for no juſt Cauſe*. Now,

II. To ſay ſomething on the behalf of the People that hear them.

1. They are *under an Obligation to worſhip God in Society* with other Chriſtians, with reſpect to God's Glory, and their own Edification, and Salvation. They are charged, *not to forſake the aſſembling of themſelves together*. And commanded to be *ſwift to hear*.

2. The way is blockt up ſo, as many cannot come to your Aſſemblies, unleſs (to uſe your own Phraſe) you would have them *damn their Souls by ſinning againſt their Conſciences*. And if you judge it better for ſuch to want the ordinary means of Salvation, than to enjoy them, by joyning with *Non-conformiſts*, we muſt take you to be *no more infallible* herein, than that *Popiſh Council*, that decreed it *righter to remain without viſible Communion, than to have it with thoſe* they call *Hereticks*.

3. Some (though they could diſpenſe with the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*, yet) cannot ſatisfie themſelves to take up under ſome *Pariſh-Miniſters*, who are *apparently* no way *qualified* for the work they take upon them. I take the 9th *Canon* of the *Council of Nice*, to be for *nulling the Ordination* of ſuch as are *ſcandalous*, or *inſufficient*. You are not for the *People's chooſing their Paſtors*; but it is evident and undeniable, that they are to *refuſe* ſome. *Beware of falſe Prophets*. Beware of them, *i. e. fly from their Communion, and have nothing to do with them* (as you ſay, *p.* 215.) They are to flee

flee from Corrupt Teachers, as from *Wolves*. As the People forſook *Photinus*, of whom *Vincent Lyrinen* ( adv. hæreſ. *c.* 16. *p.* 42. ) ſaith, *Nam quem antea quaſi arietem Gregis ſequebantur, eundem deinceps veluti Lupum fugere cæperunt*, ( which you have alſo noted, *Irenic.* p. 115. ). Some are *blind Guides*. And may not People very well be ſtartled with what Chriſt ſaith concerning ſuch? *If the Blind lead the Blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch.* And have you forgotten, or have you retracted that, in *Anſwer to Several Treatiſes*, p. 265. ( cited in *Rector of Sutton* p. 61. ) 'Men may have reaſon 'to queſtion, if not the Skill, yet the Sincerity of their Guides, and 'though they muſt have ſome, may ſeek new ones. —— The ignorant fol-'low their Guides only upon the opinion of their Skill and Integrity; and 'when they ſee reaſon to queſtion theſe, they know of no Obligation to 'follow their Conduct over Rocks and Precipices. And yet is it now *a looſe Principle?* ſome the People are to *mark and avoid*, Rom. 16. 17. ſome they muſt not *bid God ſpeed*, 2 Joh. v. 10, 11. 'There are three Caſes, ( you ſay *Unreaſ. of Sep.* p. 213. ) 'wherein the Scripture allows of Separation. The 'ſecond is (*p.* 214.) In caſe of falſe Doctrine being impoſed inſtead of true.-- '☞ If any Teachers offer to bring another Goſpel, or to corrupt the 'true one, St. *Paul* denounces an *Anathema* againſt them: and that im-'plies, that they ſhould have no Communion with them, *&c.* Now do you not here make the People *Judges of ſuch Heretical Teachers*, whom ( I ſuppoſe ) by an *Ironie* you call *admirable Judges?* p. 123. Yet for them to own and incourage ſuch, is to *partake of their Evil Deeds*. If Mr. *B.* ſaith, as you have it there, [ *Any one whoſe Miniſtry is ſuch as tendeth to Deſtruction more than to Edification, and to do more harm than good, is not to be owned*; ] I wonder what you have to ſay for ſuch, when better may be had? *Camero* ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe, as Mr. *B.* ( *pag.* 327. *col.* 1.) *Si non faciant quod ſpondet tanti Muneris profeſſio deſerendi ſunt, nam parendum Deo potius quàm Hominibus; ut ſiquis Medicinam profeſſus, &c. If any one having profeſſed Phyſick, ſhould not cure, but exaſperate the Diſeaſe, truly he ſhould be forſaken, and another is to be choſen in his room.* And what *Peter Martyr* ſays, ( *Loc. com.* p. 909. §. 33. ) may fitly be applied here, *Vexant præterea nos, quod non publica ſed privata diſceſerimus Authoritate, neq; conſiderant, Deum cuiq; mandaſſe, ut propriam ſalutem curet.* This you cannot deny, but God has *commanded every one to have a care of his Soul*, and that Men are *not bound to leſſer Societies* ( as to their own Pariſhes, or Pariſh-Miniſters, ) but ſo far as may ſtand with promoting the Salvation of their own Souls.

Who could ſpeak more fully than you have done, *Rational Account*, p. 611. *The main thing to be diſcuſſed, is, Whether the Communion of your Church or ours, be rather to be choſen in order to Salvation?* —— *The tendency to*

*that*

*that ought to be the Rule, by which we ſhould embrace or continue in the Society of any Church. Since the Regard Men ought to have of their eternal Welfare doth oblige them to make choice of the beſt means;—— the bare remote poſſibility of Salvation,— ought to have no force in determining their Choice in a matter of ſo great Importance.*

4. Many have not the leaſt Doubt, or Scruple, but thoſe Miniſters which you would not have them to hear, are ſuch as God hath owned, and ſtill doth, bleſſing their Miniſtry to their own, and others Souls Benefit. Many are well aſſured, *The Lord hath not yet forſaken that Miniſtry, you would have them forſake.* Yea, I have ſpoken with ſome *on their Death-Bed*, who have ſadly bewailed it as a great Sin of theirs, that lay as an heavy Burthen on them, (and we uſe to ſay, *Hora mortis eſt hora Veritatis*) That they had deſpiſed, and neglected the Miniſtry of ſuch. But it ſeems, had they made their Complaints to you, you could ſoon have ſatisfied them, telling them, *It was no Sin at all; but they had done well, in refuſing to hear ſuch, as ſubmitted not to the Orders of the Church.* Though perhaps they would have thought it very ſtrange, that you could have *allowed them to hear Romiſh Prieſts*, and yet ſhould ſuppoſe it *unlawful for them to hear Non-conformiſts.*

5. Theſe would alſo wonder, if you your ſelf ſhould at all queſtion ſuch Miniſters being *true Miniſters* of Chriſt, and that Worſhip (wherein they joyn) being *true Religious Worſhip*; they are confident you could not but acknowledg the truth of both theſe, *did but the Law of Man allow them.* And then for ought they know, they are *ſuch in themſelves*, and in God's Account. For no Law of Man could make that to be true, religious Worſhip, which is not ſo, abſtracted from the Conſideration of the Law's Allowance. No Law of Man could make thoſe to be true Miniſters of Chriſt, who are not ſuch, or would otherwiſe be none.

6. Becauſe I ſuppoſe, you will be ready to object here, 'How is it poſſible for Order to be kept up, if People may run after what Teachers they pleaſe? I deſire you to do me right; I am only for their hearing ſuch as they have reaſon to believe are allow'd of God, whom therefore Men ſhould allow to preach the Word. And where the publickly allowed Miniſter is not ſuch a one, they are not bound (for order-ſake) to neglect other faithful and ſound Teachers, and therein alſo to neglect their own Souls. There is no Order Men can make in the Church, that ſhould be urged, or ſtood upon againſt the end of Order, againſt the Honour of God, againſt Religion, and the true Service and Worſhip of God, and againſt the Salvation of Men, and the ordinary means thereof. And if the Sabbath *was made for Man*, (as *Mar.* 2. 27.) and therefore was not to be turned to his Deſtruction; much leſs ſhould any human, external

Order

Order be ſtrictly urged and preſſed to Men's Deſtruction. *Biſhop Bilſon* (*Chriſtian Subject*, part 3 *p.* 299. An. 1586.) ſpeaking to that, [*We would have things done in order*] returns this ſmart Anſwer, *Call you that Order, where Chriſt ſhall ſtand without doors, till your Clergy conſent to bring him in?* Though according to the *order of Nature*, light Bodies move upwards, and heavy Bodies tend downwards in their ordinary Courſe; yet (which *Camero* applies to a like caſe, *p.* 581. *col.* 1. §. 2.) this *very order of Nature is inverted*, *Nè detur vacuum*. Here I call to mind what you ſay, (*pag.* 198.) 'Is Schiſm indeed become ſuch an inconſiderable and petty Inconvenience? And me-thinks, that *Inconvenience*, the Breach of external Order (which with you is *Schiſm*) is a far leſs Evil, if it be Evil in this caſe, compared with the *Miſchief* of Men's deſtroying their own Souls, or neglecting the means of their Salvation. There is an higher Law, which (to uſe the words of *Camero*) *Ordinem deſerere jubet ut extremo malo & irreparabili jacturæ occurratur*, &c. And *qui tam juſtâ & urgente occaſione ordniem deſerit, reipſâ non deſerit, ſed ſervat.* And that Inſtance he gives there is convincing, *If a Souldier knew his Captain, his Leader, was for opening the Gates to the Enemy*, and yet *followed ſuch a Leader*, keeping Rank and Order ſo unſeaſonably, he would *ſhew himſelf a Traitor*, rather than a faithful Souldier.

The Diſciples would ſeem to have been for *Order* there (as you are) when they were hindring Chriſt's Service, *Mar.* 9. 38. *Luk.* 9. 49. *Maſter, we ſaw one caſting out Devils in thy name,— and we forbad him, becauſe he followeth not us.* Now I heartily wiſh, even for your own ſake, from that true and due Reſpect I owe to you, that you would more impartially examine what you have been doing, and reflect upon your ſelf; conſider ſeriouſly, whether you are not forbidding, and condemning ſome, as faithful Followers of Chriſt as your ſelf, even in their ſerving Chriſt, and ſerving their Generation? What are your Thoughts of ſuch, as *Joſeph* and *Richard Alleyn*, with divers others that might be named, who kept to their miniſterial Work, and (as you ſay of *Father Latimer*) *never repented them of it?* If now they have that *Well-come home, Well done good and faithful Servants, enter into the Joy of your Lord.*] How far are they above all your Cenſures? And me-thinks, it deſerves Men's ſerious Conſideration, whether they pray as they ought [*Thy Kingdom come*] or whether indeed they act not againſt their own Prayers, who indeavour to hinder the preaching of the Goſpel, (a means of enlarging and building up God's Kingdom?) And as you *declare to the World*, (p. 394.) you are *one that believes a day of Judgment to come*, (which I would not once queſtion) I beſeech you, Sir, think well of what that *well diſpoſed Gentleman* (as you call him) ſays, (I think *gravely and piouſly*) *Letter out of the Country*,

pag. 38,39.) *Let us bring the Cauſe before our Supream and Final Judg. And bethink your ſelf whether of theſe two things he will be moſt likely to have regard unto, the ſaving of Souls, which He bought with his Blood; or the preſerving inviolate certain Humane Inſtitutions and Rules, confeſſed by the Deviſers of them, not to be neceſſary,* &c. And ſo much of your firſt Concluſion, and mine.

Your ſecond Concluſion follows, *Preface*, p. 73.

2. 'Thoſe are new Churches, when Men erect diſtinct Societies for 'Worſhip, under diſtinct and peculiar Officers, governing by Laws, and 'Church-Rules different from that Form they ſeparate from.

Here, 1. I cannot but look on you as very unfortunate, unhappy in this Cauſe you have eſpouſed. How oft do you greatly expoſe your ſelf, that what you urge againſt your Brethren may juſtly be retorted on you? So here, how plain is it, that you *look but on one ſide*, (which as I remember you ſuppoſe thoſe that differ from you to be faulty in?) Had you not one Thought, that if you owned ſuch a Concluſion as this, I ſhould be likely to tell you, you had ſpoiled your Cauſe, *Nihil quod nimis, ſatis*, that by *proving too much*, you would in effect *prove nothing* of that you aim at? Should you not have conſidered, what an Argument you here put into the Mouths of the Diſſenters againſt the *National* Church of *England*, againſt *Dioceſan* Churches, and againſt *Parochial* Churches too?

1. Will not many be ready to tell you, that it follows undeniably from this Concluſion of yours, that you have made the *National* Church of *England*, and the *Dioceſan* Churches therein, *New* (unlawful) Churches; becauſe *under divers peculiar Officers, governing by Laws and Church-Rules different from the Apoſtolical Primitive Church*, (as from other Reformed Churches.) If thoſe are *new*, unlawful Schiſmatical Churches with you, that are *under diſtinct and peculiar Officers, governing by Laws, and Church-Rules different from* the Apoſtolical truly Primitive Churches, (as I ſuppoſe it muſt come to that, *Primum in unoquoq; genere eſt Regula & Menſura reliquorum*) what work have you made here? What an heavy Task, and hard Province have you taken on you? Can you ever prove, that there are no Officers, Laws, Rules and Orders in your Church, different from what were in the true Primitive Church? Can you ever find all theſe Officers, *Arch-Biſhops, Lord-Biſhops, Deans, Chancellors*, &c. down to *Apparitors*, in the Primitive Church? Will you undertake to find there all our *Eccleſiaſtical Canons*, even *Rules* for *kneeling in the Act of Receiving, for ſigning with the Croſs in Baptiſm*, for excluding the Parents, and ſetting *God-Fathers and God-Mothers* in their ſtead, with a Rule for *peculiar, appropriate Veſtments*, &c.

To

635

To ſay here, that though you have peculiar Officers, Laws, and Rules, different from the Apoſtolical Primitive Church; yet you do not *own your ſelves to be a Church ſeparate* from that Primitive Church, will not bring you off. For, this many Diſſenters likewiſe ſay, they ſeparate not from you, but *hold Communion with you in all that is neceſſary*; and further have more *Local, Preſential Communion* with you, than you can pretend to have with the Primitive Church. Yet you will have their Aſſemblies ſeparate Churches, while they worſhip God by any other Rule than yours, though their Worſhip be as agreeable to the Scripture-Rule. And yet can you, or any mortal Man prove, that others may not be *allowed to differ from you in ſuch things, wherein you differ from the Apoſtolical*, primitive Church?

Again, it will as little help you to ſay, That you ſpeak of particular Congregations, or *Societies for Worſhip*. For,

2. Do you not here make your *Parochial* Congregations alſo *New Churches?* If the Primitive Church had not your *Liturgy*, were not bound to the uſe of your *Book of Common-Prayer*, then you cannot deny, but you are under a ſomwhat *different Rule*. And are there not ſome Pariſhes, that have only *Deacons* to officiate? And may I not be bold to tell you, that you can never prove your *Deacons* the ſame with thoſe in the Churches erected by the Apoſtles? According to *F. Paul Sarpi* (*of matters Benefic.* N. 27.) *Deacons* were *Miniſters of temporal things*. You your ſelf ſay, *p.*311. 'It was no properly Church-power which they had; but they were Ste-'wards of the common Stock. Then are not *Deacons*, that are allowed to *preach*, and *baptize*, &c. *different Officers?* By this time I hope, you will be ſenſible, what a Wound you have given to the Cauſe, you take upon you to defend, by this Concluſion, which is my firſt Note upon it.

(2.) At the firſt view and reading of this your ſecond Concluſion, I was willing to hope, that then you would not condemn ſuch Aſſemblies as Mr. *B*'s. who leave the *ruling Work* to you, and are glad if they be permitted to preach and hear God's Word, and do not ſeparate from you, but joyn with you, even in Sacraments, as well as other parts of God's Worſhip. But looking farther into your Book, I ſee my Miſtake: For you ſay, *pag.* 98. (as was cited before) 'No Man denies, that more 'places for Worſhip are deſirable, and would be very uſeful, where *&c.* But 'is it poſſible that Mr. *B.* ſhould think the Caſe alike, where the Orders of 'our Church are conſtantly neglected, the Authority of the Biſhops is 'ſlighted and contemned? *Taceo cætera.*

Now I had thought, you might have granted more places for Worſhip, not only *deſireable*, and *uſeful*, but *very neceſſary* for ſuch as cannot come to yours, as far as the Apoſtle makes *hearing of the Word neceſſary*, Rom. 10. 14, 17.

636



more neceſſary than *unneceſſary Modes of Worſhip*, or ſuch matters as you count but *indifferent things*. But by what is here laſt cited, it is too plain and manifeſt, that you *condemn all Religious Aſſemblies* in *England*, that follow not your *Church-Rule*, and *own not the Authority of the Biſhops*. And thus it ſeems, where you are zealous in words for *Communion*, yet *Subjection* to the Biſhops Authority, is the thing you drive at. And upon this Account, though your Diſcourſe was *calculated chiefly for the City of London*, yet it may *indifferently ſerve for all other Places* and Meetings in *England*, where your Church-Rules and Orders are not obſerved and obeyed. As to our grief, we in the Country have found many of the conformable Clergy, with others, improving your Authority and Arguments as far as they are able, even againſt ſuch Aſſemblies, as meet off from the times of the Parochial Congregations meeting, that they might not be cenſured to meet *in oppoſition*. Theſe are ſeparate Meetings with you, as well as others; becauſe the *Orders of the Church are neglected* in them. But,

(3.) What will you ſay of thoſe Aſſemblies, where Chriſt taught, and the Diſciples likewiſe whom he ſent forth? Did they do this, as *under the Inſpection and Government of the Rulers* that then were? Were they tyed up to the *Church-Rules* of the Jews in what they did? were they not *diſtinct and peculiar Officers?* Certainly, you mince the matter, when you ſay, *pag.* 163. 'Our Saviour himſelf did only Teach his Diſciples oc-'caſionally, and at certain Seaſons. As if he taught but rarely, or ſeldom. And as if he was *content with his Diſciples only* to be his Hearers. (As you would have the ſilenced Miniſters think it enough, if they have *three or four beſides the Family.*) whereas we read of Chriſt's teaching the *Multitude*, and of the *Multitude preſſing upon him* to hear. And when he ſent forth the Twelve, *Mat.* 10. *preaching* was a good part of their Work. And the *Miracles* they wrought, were to *ſeal* and confirm their *Doctrine*. So the Seventy, (*Luk.* 10.) were to *teach*. So much is implied, *ver.* 16. He *that heareth you, heareth me*; and he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me, *&c.* Now what will you make of them, and their Hearers? Here were *diſtinct and peculiar Teachers, not under the Government of the Jewiſh Church-Rulers:* Then, were they *new* (unlawful) Churches? I know you will not ſay it. But if you ſay here, though they *differed in ſome things from the Form of the Jewiſh Church*; yet they did not *ſeparate*: Well, grant that; yet conſider, whether this Example may not juſtify thoſe, who ordinarily joyn with their Parochial Congregations, in hearing *Non-conformiſts* at other times? And may it not juſtify thoſe *Non-conformiſt* Miniſters, that do not ſeparate from the Parochial Congregations? And how many more ſuch would be ſeen, even in *Corporations*, but for *the five Miles Act*, which forbids their open Appearance in ſuch Places? And yet do you never

diſtinguiſh

637

distinguish betwixt such, and others (that I can find,) but all are alike to you. Yea, so far are you from favouring these, that sometimes you would have the Sin of those that *own you for true Churches*, and have Communion with you, as far as they can, to be *aggravated*, and more *inexcusable*, in having other *distinct* (which you account *separate*) *Meetings*.

*Ball* against *Can* (*part.* 1. *p.* 82.) *Neither did our Saviour, nor his Disciples before his Death, take upon them to erect a new visible Church, altogether distinct from the erring Synagogue, but lived in that Church, and frequented the Ordinances, neither as absolute Members of the Synagogue, nor yet as the visible Church distinct from it: But as visible Members of that primitive Church, from which that Synagogue had degenerated.*

I find you so hard, and unyielding in this Controversy, I should be glad, if you would grant a little here, (which I wonder how you can so stifly deny) in hopes of more in time.

(4.) As you know our *Reformers* pleaded, that (in their *departure from Rome*) they *forsook not the Church, but approached nearer to the Catholick, and Primitive Church* (as *P. Martyr Loc. Com. p.* 915.) So those Christian Assemblies, you censure as *new* (unlawful) Churches, because not *under your Rule*, suppose you have censured them rashly here, if in their Worship they are *nearer the Scripture-Rule*. And truly (Sir) you *speak so home*, and fully to the purpose (*Rational Account*, *p.* 356, 357.) as is quite beyond the power and reach of my poor Imagination to conceive, how you can ever answer your self. There you say, 'Supposing any Church (tho pretending to be never so Catholick) doth restrain her Communion within such 'narrow and unjust Bounds—☞ 'Whatever Church takes upon her to 'limit and inclose the bounds of the Catholick, becomes thereby divided 'from the Communion of the Catholick Church: and all such who disown 'such an unjust inclosure, do not so much divide from the Communion of 'that Church so inclosing, ☞ as return to the Communion of the Primitive and Universal Church. How will Dissenters thank you for this? Methinks, I have some hope that we shall in time be agreed, that we shall have you (who do so clearly understand and apprehend what *Schism* there is in any Churches *limiting* and *inclosing the bounds of the Catholick Church*; shall we not have you) again pleading for *Catholick Terms*? And you say further, *ibid. p.* 357.—'The disowning of those things wherein 'your Church is become Schismatical, cannot certainly be any culpable 'Separation. For, whatever is so, must be from a Church so far as it is 'Catholick; but in our case it is from a Church so far only as it is not Ca-'tholick, *&c.* While such Passages (so greatly befriending Dissenters, that would gladly close with you upon *Catholick Terms*) drop from you at unawares, when you scarce think of them, what an *excellent Advocate* should they

they have of you, if indeed you was minded to undertake their Cauſe? Yet how contrary hereunto are you, in your too *partial Account*, *p.* 305. where *your Gentleman* pinching you with this Queſtion, *Can it be proved that Chriſt hath inveſted the Guides of this Church — with a power to make Laws and Decrees, preſcribing not only things neceſſary for common Order and Decency, but new federal Rites, and teaching Signs and Symbols, &c.* 'I anſwer, (ſay you) 'that ſuch a Church hath power to appoint Rules of Order and Decency 'not repugnant to the Word (which whether this be to the purpoſe of *new federal Rites*, and *teaching Signs and Symbols*, will I ſuppoſe be further examined) *which on that account others are bound to ſubmit to; and to take ſuch care of its preſervation, as to admit none to its Priviledges, but ſuch as do ſubmit to them*; (Here you are quite off from your *Catholick Terms* again, and for *limiting* and *incloſing the Catholick Church*) *and if any diſturb the Peace of this Church* (and here you do not clear the moſt peaceable Diſſenters, that only meet for the Worſhip of God, and *ſeparate no farther* from your Church, than *as it is not Catholick*: you go on) *The Civil Magiſtrate may juſtly inflict Civil Penalties upon them for it.* Is this your Mind, that all that *ſubmit not to thoſe new federal Rites* (as they are ſuppoſed) and *teaching Signs and Symbols* (ſpoken of) ſhould be both *debarred of Church-Priviledges*, and *laid under Civil Penalties, as diſturbers of the Churches Peace?* Then I cannot but wiſh that Governours may have more Moderation and *Clemency*, or poor Diſſenters more *Faith and Patience*, than you ſhew *Chriſtian Charity* herein.

But if they are *as near the Primitive Church*, and *as much in Communion with the Catholick Church* as you are; yea, and in *Communion* with you ſtill, *ſo far as* you are *Catholick*, what great reaſon can you have ſo ſeverely to condemn them? I hope the *Doctrine* of the Non-conformiſts generally is ſound, their *Worſhip* agreeable to the Word. The only Queſtion then remaining ſeems to be; *By what Authority they do theſe things?* And *who gave them Authority?* Now it is true, they cannot pretend *Authority from the Biſhops*: but if they can prove, they have *Authority from Chriſt*, is not that ſufficient? If he hath *called* them to the work of the Miniſtry, and commandeth them to be diligent and faithful in it (according to their Abilities and Opportunities) methinks Men ſhould not deny their Authority. And whether may not *ſuch Societies* as you call *new Churches*, return what you cite (*p.* 179, 180.) out of *Calvin* (*Inſtit. l.* 4. *c.* 1. *n.* 9.) as proving them to be *true Churches*, *They having the Word of God truly preached, and Sacraments adminiſtred according to Chriſt's Inſtitution?* Now he ſaith (as you have him) *where ever theſe Marks are to be found in particular Societies, thoſe are true Churches, howſoever they are diſtributed according to Humane Conveniences.* And therefore if you did not *look only on one ſide*, you might probably ſee, that you are *no more allowed wilfully to ſeparate from them*, than they are from you.

And

And as that *Synod* of the Reformed Churches in *France*, at *Charenton*, *A. D.* 1631. *declared* (as you have it *p.* 186.) *That there was no Idolatry, or Superſtition in the Lutheran Churches; and therefore the Members of their Churches might be received into Communion with them, without renouncing their own Opinions or Practices:* So why might not the Non-conformiſts, and their Hearers be taken into, or acknowledged in Communion with the Church of *England*, *without renouncing their Opinions or Practices*, they being certainly *as far from Idolatry or Superſtition*, as any of the *Lutheran Churches*. As the *Helvetian Churches* (with you, *p.* 187) *declare*; *That no Separation ought to be made for different Rites and Ceremonies, where there is an Agreement in Doctrine: and the true Concord of Churches lies in the Doctrine of Chriſt, and the Sacraments delivered by him:* Even ſo becauſe the Non-Conformiſts *conſent* with you *in Doctrine*, do not break them off from your Communion, for their *difference about Ceremonies*.

May not ſeveral Churches differ in *Modes* and *Forms of Worſhip*, and yet have Communion with one another? Some Difference you cannot but grant betwixt your *Cathedral Service*, and that in common Country Churches. *p.* 146, 147. You will not ſay, the Churches in other Nations, that have not the ſame Rule with you, are *Schiſmaticks*. No, not though ſuch came over into *England*, and lived among you. And what if the *old Liturgy*, and that *new one* (which you cannot but remember the compiling of, and preſenting to the Biſhops, at the *Savoy* 1661.) had both paſſed, and been allowed, for Miniſters to uſe, as they judged moſt convenient, might not ſeveral Miniſters and Congregations in this caſe have uſed *different Modes* of Worſhip, without Breach of the Churches Peace, or counting each other *Schiſmaticks*? Would you have called thoſe, *new ſeparate Churches*, that made uſe of the *new reformed Liturgy*? And what if a *Dutch Church* was in your Pariſh? Would you diſclaim Communion with them, becauſe they had ſome *Rules* and *Orders different* from yours? And what if divers of your Pariſh, living near it, ſhould joyn with that Congregation, would you thence conclude, that they erected *a new ſeparate* Church? And, as the *Canon* 1640. ſpeaks of *bowing towards the Eaſt or Altar*, *That they which uſe this Rite ſhould not deſpiſe them which uſe it not*, &c. if now our King and Parliament (like *true Catholick Moderators*) ſhould put forth an *Henoticum*, make an healing Law, enjoyning *Conformiſts* and *Non-conformiſts*, that *agree in the ſame Faith and Worſhip for Subſtance*, to attend peacably on their Miniſtery, and ſerve God and his Church the beſt they can, whether they uſe the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*, or no, without uncharitable Cenſures, and bitter Reflections upon one another, either *in Word, or Writing*; would you yet ſay, that the *Non-conformiſts* Aſſemblies (not following your Rules and Orders) were no other than *new ſeparate Churches*?

(5.) I know no *Laws*, nor *Eccleſiaſtical Canons*, that the preſent *Non-conformiſts* have made. And *non-entis nulla ſunt prædicata.* But if your meaning be, that it is enough to prove them *New Churches*, that they come not up to your Laws, and *Church-Rules*, and therefore are ſo far different from you, as they conform not to you, I would argue thus:

Either *Conformity in all things* to your Church-Rules is neceſſary to Communion with the Church of *England*, and to cut off the charge of being of a *New* Church, or not.

If *Conformity in all things* be not neceſſary here, why may not ſober Diſſenters, that own the Church of *England* for a true Church, and profeſs the ſame Faith, and worſhip God *in no other manner*, than *according to the Liturgy and Practice of the Church of* England, (as you ſay, *p.* 160. Mr. B declared in writing, and as I told you a good Lawyer pleadeth, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 26, & 50.) I ſay, why may not ſuch be owned as in Communion with the Church of *England?* Why do you charge them with *erecting new ſeparate Churches*, meerly becauſe they differ from you in ſome alterable Circumſtances, and ſeparable Accidents, not neceſſary to Churches Concord and Communion? I ſee, you dare not ſay, that thoſe things wherein they differ from you are any *parts of Worſhip*; So they are of the ſame Faith, and agree with you in *all parts of Worſhip.* And is not all this (with their owning themſelves to be be of the *Church of England*, ſo far as it is *Catholick*) a bidding fair for your Reception of them, and acknowledging them ſtill in Communion with you? And then why have you ſo many words of ſuch being *no good Chriſtians*, becauſe *Members of no Church?* (as *pag.* 104, 105, 110. *f.*) If *Conformity in all things* to your Church-Rules be not neceſſary, pray tell us what is neceſſary, and what not: what things may be diſpenſed with, and what not. *Rector of Sutton*, p. 27. *n.* 9. You were put in mind of it to inquire, whether there be not ſome in publick Place, (not very well ſatisfied with what they have done) who come not up to your Church-Rules? As, ſome read not all the *Common-Prayer* they are enjoyned to read, and yet had declared their *Aſſent and Conſent* to the uſe (at leaſt) as you would have it. Some uſe not the *Surplice*, ſome omit the *Croſs* in Baptiſm; ſome dare not put away from the Sacrament any, meerly for *not kneeling.* And yet you charge not ſuch with Schiſm, (*pag.* 148. *n.* 5.) yet have they different Rules, or at leaſt, they differ from your Rules, as well as *Non-conformiſts.* And I know not whether you may not be underſtood to allow Men to go from their Pariſh-Church (*pag.* 145. *n.* 1.) provided they elſewhere joyn with your Churches, as Members of them. What then is the *parting Point* from the Communion of your Church, or the *trying*

*Point* of Conformity, without which a *New Church* is erected? Here I offer this Note upon what you ſay farther, *pag.* 148. *n.* 5. That many whom you condemn, though not ſatisfied with ſuch and ſuch Orders of the Church, yet *continue in all Acts of Communion* with your Church, (or in all that you will call *parts of Worſhip*) and draw not others from it, *upon any meer Pretence*, no, not at all; though they dare not but joyn at other times with *Non-conformiſts*, in that which they are well aſſured is as truly God's Worſhip, and if they ſay, in ſome Reſpects more pure, you have not yet diſproved it. And therefore you ſhould *make good your word* there, and not charge ſuch with Schiſm.

Or if you ſhould ſay, *Conformity in all things* to your Church-Rules is neceſſary, that if Men differ never ſo little from thoſe Rules, it is to *erect new Churches*, what woful rending work would this make? By a *Parity of Reaſon*, may not other foreign Churches be denied to have Communion with the Church of *England?* How many that could not ſubmit to theſe Laws and Rules, without receding from their own *publick Confeſſions?* Could the *French*, and *Belgick* Churches aſſent to the *Jus divinum* of Epiſcopacy? could they own it, as *evident to all Men diligently reading the holy Scriptures*, to be of Apoſtolical Inſtitution? And would not any one that reads the *Declaration of the Faith and Ceremonies of the Pfaltzgraves Churches*, printed at *London* A. D. 1637, take them to have been averſe from ſuch Conformity, as the Church of *England* ſtands upon? You glory in the *good Opinion of the Reformed Churches, and Proteſtant Divines abroad, concerning the Conſtitution and Orders of our Church:* and their *owning Communion with our Church*, (*pag.* 96, 97.) And you *make nothing* of what hath been returned by way of Anſwer to Dr. *D. Bonaſius Vapulans* is but a little Creature (I confeſs, to look on) yet ſome that have read it, do not look on it *as nothing*. But if an owning of the *Divine, or Apoſtolical Right* of Epiſcopacy, and *Re-ordination*, &c. be made the Terms of their Communion with our Church, how many Proteſtant Divines abroad, that would renonuce Communion with us, rather than be pleaſed with it upon ſuch Terms?

And further, if *Conformity in all things* to your Church-Rules be neceſſary, *&c.* How many *Parochial* Miniſters and Congregations (as was noted before) muſt be denied to be in Communion with the Church of *England*, whom for the ſame Reaſon you muſt call *new erected Churches?* For as one ſays (alluding to that) *They who themſelves were circumciſed, kept not the Law.* They who have *aſſented* and *conſented*, obſerve not the Orders and Rules to which they have given their *Aſſent*, &c. And yet (as you have it from another) *The Prieſts in the Temple break the Law, and are blameleſs.* Then muſt you not either acquit many Diſſenters here, or condemn many Conformiſts?

642



You ſee how fain I would have Proteſtant Diſſenters acknowledged ſtill to have Communion with the Church of *England*, (if it might be) the difference being not in ſuch things as belong to it, *as a Church*. If you took away thoſe things, which are as the *Wall of Partition* betwixt you and them, your Churches would be as ſound and entire without them. And if you make them Schiſmaticks, for differing from you in ſuch things, while they agree with you in all things neceſſary; whether will you not make your ſelves, or other Churches (you would be aſhamed to diſown) Schiſmaticks, who differ from you in as great Matters, as ſuch Diſſenters do? Here let me preſs you a little further, Keep to your own Rule, *Preface p.46.* 'As far as the Obligation to preſerve the Church's Peace extends, ſo far 'doth the Sin of Schiſm reach. Then it follows, if the *Obligation to preſerve the Church's Peace* extends ſo far as to the Rulers and Governours of the Church, there may be as much Schiſm in their ſetting up unneceſſary Rules, which others cannot ſubmit to, as in Mens varying from ſuch Rules. *P.209.* You argue, 'From the Obligation which lies upon all Chriſtians, to pre-'ſerve the Peace and Unity of the Church. And now (ſay you) 'I have 'brought the matter home to the Conſciences of Men. Had you put the Matter home indifferently and *impartially* to the Conſciences of Men on both ſides; that is, both of *Impoſers*, *and Diſſenters*, many could not but have thought in their Conſciences, you was to be commended for it. But then, had you not pleaded as much for Diſſenters, as here you plead againſt them? I muſt grant, they ought *(for the Peace and Unity of the Church)* to yield as far as they can, without ſinning againſt God, and their own Souls: and ſhould not Impoſers do the like? Were this one Rule agreed on, what Peace and Unity would ſoon follow? What *Chillingworth* (*p.* 283. § 71.) ſays of Proteſtants, That *they grant their Communion to all who hold with them, not all things, but things neceſſary, that is, ſuch as are in Scripture plainly delivered:*] Make this good of the Church of *England*, and by my conſent, all we (who have unwillingly appeared againſt you) will readily and joyfully give you our publick Thanks.

What you ſay further, *p.* 209. may thus be handed back again to you: If there be *no ſufficient Reaſon to juſtify* ſuch Rules and Orders, if they are a *Violation of the Unity of the Church*, you there make it *a Sin, as much as murder is, and as plainly forbidden.* And therefore *I do earneſtly deſire* (as you, *p.* 213.) all Parties concerned, as *they love their own Souls, and as they would avoid the Guilt of ſo great a Sin, impartially and without prejudice to conſider that Paſſage of* Irenæus (with you, *p.* 212.) *That Chriſt will come to judg thoſe who make Schiſms in the Church, and rather regard their own Advantage, than the Church's Unity, &c.* And if any indifferent Men had the matter put to them to decide, who were more likely to *regard their own Advantage*, whe-

ther

643

ther ſome of you, or ſuch as Mr. *B.* one might ſoon gueſs, what their Sentence, or Verdict would be. If I ſeem here, and ſometimes elſewhere to *digreſs* a little; yet I think in reaſon you ſhould overlook it. I would hope that in time you may be convinced of a *greater Digreſſion* in the ſcope of your late Writings.

(6.) If you, and the Church of *England*, will not be ſo favourable towards thoſe *diſtinct Societies*, that are not under your Church-Rules, as to acknowledg them in Communion with you; yet by what you, and *Chillingworth* ſay, I ſee not but they may be ſtill in Communion with the *Catholick Church*, and Members of it. *Knot* talketh thus to our Reproach, (*Charity maint. part* 1. *c.* 5. § 38.) *Proteſtants cannot avoid the note of Schiſm, at leaſt by reaſon of their mutual Separation from one another. For moſt certain it is, that there is very great difference— between the* Lutherans, *the rigid* Calviniſts, *and the Proteſtants of* England. But it is obſervable, what *Chillingworth* ſays, p. 255. Eighthly (to that) *That all the Members of the Catholick Church, muſt of neceſſity be united in external Communion.*] *Which tho it were much to be deſired it were ſo, yet certainly cannot be perpetually true — Divers times it hath happened, as in the caſe of* Chryſoſtome *and* Epiphanius, *that particular Men, and particular Churches, have upon an over-valued difference, either renounced Communion mutually, or one of them ſeparated from the other, and yet both have continued Members of the Catholick Church.* Here let us ſuppoſe ſome unhappy difference to ariſe among your ſelves, as if ſome were for the publick condemning of your *Irenicum*, ſome againſt it; ſome offended at thoſe Miniſters who appear not as zealous againſt Diſſenters, as you have ſhewed your ſelf, and others offended as much at you, and them; ſome taking offence at thoſe that *bow at the word Jeſus*, or *bow towards the Altar*, and others taking the like offence at thoſe who ſcruple, or forbear ſuch Practice. Suppoſe now the contention was carried ſo high, that the diſagreeing Parties *refuſed Communion* with one another hereupon; and if it came to that, I would know which of theſe ſhould be the *new Church?* Or whether both Parties might not yet be in Communion with the Church of *England?* And much more, may not the ſame *Catholick Church* hold Conformiſts, and Proteſtant Diſſenters?

And you give us this Note, *Rational Account*, p. 331. 'He that ſepa'rates only from particular Churches as to ſuch things which concern not 'their Being, is only ſeparated from the Communion of thoſe Churches, 'and not the Catholick. Now will you ſay, thoſe Rules and Orders, about which all the Difference is betwixt you, and the *Non-conformiſts*, *concern the Being of your Church?* I doubt you will never be able to convince many, but the Church of *England* might be every jot as *well* without them.

But if it ſhould happen, that any Error, or Corruption is to be found therein, then you have more to ſay for thoſe you here oppoſe. *Ibid.* and *pag.* 332. 'which is therefore more properly a Separation from the Errors, 'than the Communion of ſuch a Church. Wherefore if we ſuppoſe that 'there is no one viſible Church, whoſe Communion is not tainted with 'ſome Corruptions, though, if theſe Corruptions be injoyned as Condi-'tions of Communion, I cannot communicate with any of thoſe Chur-'ches; yet it follows not that I am ſeparated from the external Commu-'nion of the Catholick Church, but that I only ſuſpend Communion 'with thoſe particular Churches, till I may ſafely joyn with them. Which you illuſtrate there by a Compariſon, where you have theſe remarkable Words, 'And if ſeveral other Perſons, be of the ſame mind 'with me, and we therefore joyn together; Do we therefore divide our 'ſelves from the whole World by only taking care of our own Safe-'ty? *&c.*

So *Chillingworth* ſpeaks as like you as, if one had *taken his Hints* from the other, *pag.* 298. He is for diſtinguiſhing, not *confounding* theſe two, *departing* from *the Church*, and *departing from ſome general Opinions and Practices, which did not conſtitute, but vitiate the Church.* More he hath to that purpoſe. But that which I would ſpecially note out of him here (to ſhew the Harmony and Conſent betwixt you, which otherwiſe ſhould have come in before) *pag.* 269. *A Man may poſſibly leave ſome Opinion, or Practice of a Church* (ſays he) —— *and continue ſtill a Member of that Church: provided that what he forſakes be not one of thoſe things wherein the Eſſence of the Church conſiſts. Whereas peradventure this Practice may be ſo involved with the external Communion of this Church, that it may be ſimply impoſſible for him to leave this Practice, and not to leave the Churches external Communion.*

I cite ſuch Paſſages as theſe, becauſe I would have the World know, and take notice, what Friends you are ſometimes to poor *Non-conformiſts.* That if any ſhould now ſend an *Hue and Cry* after them, as after *Murderers*, you are willing they ſhould *take Sanctuary* either in your Church, or in the *Church Catholick*, the *New Church*, your ſecond Concluſion ſpeaks of, being not ſo ſafe.

Now my ſecond Concluſion is this.

2. That many of thoſe *Societies* which you condemn, do not *ſeparate* from the Church of *England*, many of them have ordinary external Communion with you; and though in their Worſhip, they do not in all things follow your *Church-Rules* and Orders, yet their Worſhip cannot be proved contrary, but is agreeable to *Scripture-Rule.* And as for thoſe, who are not ſatisfied to go ſo far, as to hold external Communion with you, yet having *Communion* with you *in the ſame Faith*, it were a very

deſirable

deſirable thing, that the *Bars to their full Communion* with you were removed (if they be ſuch things as are not neceſſary.) And in the mean time (poſſibly) thoſe *New Churches* are better than *no Churches*.

And indeed it is matter of wonder to me, if you have no more Charity for ſuch, have no better Thoughts of them, than of thoſe *idle*, *looſe*, *profane Perſons*, that wholly neglect and contemn the Worſhip of God, *that never go to any Church at all*.

I would ſay more to this, did I not think enough is ſaid already.

Now I come to your *laſt Concluſion*.

3. 'As to things in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed 'Churches left undetermined by the Law of God, and in matters of 'meer Order and Decency, and wholly as to Form and Government, e-'very one, notwithſtanding what his private Judgment may be of them, 'is bound for the Peace of the Church of God, to ſubmit to the Determi-'nation of the lawful Governours of the Church.

But would you not lead us here into a Maze, a *Labyrinth*, without any Clew to guide us out? Let us now ſee how *Pertinent and Material* this is to your purpoſe.

Here firſt, I muſt ſuppoſe this *Queſtion*, viz. How far, or *in what things is every Man bound (whatever his private Judgment be) for the Churches Peace, to ſubmit to the Determination of the lawful Governours of the Church?*

And your *Anſwer* is, every one is bound to ſubmit to the Determination of ſuch (what ever his private Judgment be.)

1. *As to things in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches left undetermin'd by the Law of God.*

2. And *in matters of meer Order and Decency.*

3. *And wholly as to the Form of Government*; This I think, you cannot deny to be the true *Analyſis* of your third Concluſion.

How *pertinent* this your Reſolution is to the caſe of Diſſenters, and how *material* to give them Satisfaction, will appear by examining the ſeveral Parts.

But firſt, it is worth nothing, that you ſpeak only of the *Determination of the lawful Governours of the Church*. Implying, that Men are *not bound to ſubmit to the Determination* of ſuch as may be proved *Uſurpers*, ſuch as are not *lawful Governours* of the Church. Then ſo far you and they may be agreed, that if the Pope ſhould ſet up a *Patriarch*, *&c.* in *England*, Men were not bound to ſubmit to their Determination, till ſuch could be proved *lawful Governours* of the Church. And then whether you have fully anſwered your *Gentleman* (p. 305.) and others, and proved that *Chriſt hath inveſted with Power to make ſuch Decrees and Determinations* (as lawful Governours of the Church) *thoſe who never were choſen*, or approved by the People, is another Queſtion? But

But then where lawful Governours of the Church determine, you tell us; (1.) Every one is bound to submit to their Determination, *As to things in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches left undetermin'd by the Law of God.*

Here 1. You should have told us, whether by the *Primitive* Churches you meant the *primo-primitive* Churches, or only such *Ancient Churches*, as those of the fourth, or fifth Age. One would guess that these latter are *your Primitive Churches.* Now in my Thoughts *King James* was quite beyond the Cardinal, and got the upper Ground, ( In *Defence of the Right of Kings*, p. 398.) where the Cardinal arguing, that *a Doctrine believed and practised in the Church, in the continual Current of the last Eleven Hundred Years, was not to be condemned.*] His Majesty replied; *In these VVords he maketh a secret Confession, that in the first five hundred Years, the same Doctrine was neither apprehended by Faith, nor approved by Practice. VVherein to my understanding, the Lord Cardinal voluntarily giveth over the Suit; for the Church in the time of the Apostles, their Disciples,—— was no more ignorant what Authority the Church is to challenge,—— than at any time since in any succeeding Age, in which as Pride hath still flowed to the heighth of a full Sea, so Purity of Religion and Manners hath kept for the most part at a low VVater-mark.*

You should have told us also what *Reformed Churches* you meant, whether *all*, or only *some* of them? And if but some, whether those that only took the Scripture, as their Rule in reforming; or those that took in the Example and Practice of some of those Ancient Churches, together with it?

2. What are *those things, that in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches are left undetermin'd by the Law of God; besides matters of meer Order and Decency, and what relates to Form of Government?*

3. Can this be a *safe and sure Rule?* When you grant the *Church may err*, and general Councils may err; may they not then judg some things left undetermin'd by the Word, that are not so left? *Chillingworth* grants, *there may be just and necessary Cause to depart from some Opinions and Practices of the Catholick Church* ( p. 298.) And you say partly the same in your *Rational Account* ( pag. 331, 332.) Those Errors in practice, in the Judgment of the Church, may be such things as are left undetermined by the Word, when yet others are not bound to submit to them. You tell us, *Rational Account*, p. 627. *The matter to be enquired here is, what Liberty of Prescription is allowed by vertue of the Law of Christ; for since he hath made Laws to govern his Church by, it is most senseless pleading Prescription, till you have particularly examined, how far such Prescription is allowed by him.* So then it is not enough to say, in the Judgment of the Primitive and

Reformed

Reformed Churches ſuch things are left undetermined by God's Law, and the Church hath Power to determine them. But Men are to examine whether ſuch Liberty be allowed by Chriſt. And as you go on, *p.* 628. 'It may be you will tell me, that in this Caſe, Preſcription interprets 'Law, and that the Churches Poſſeſſion argues it was the Will of Chriſt. 'But ſtill the Proof lies upon your ſide, ſince you run your ſelf into new 'Briars; for you muſt prove that there is no way to interpret this Law, 'but by the Practice (here I muſt ſay by the *Judgment*) of the Church, 'and which is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of all, that the Church cannot come 'into the Poſſeſſion of any thing, but what was originally given her by 'the *Legiſlator*.—— He that undertakes to prove it impoſſible that the 'Church ſhould claim by an undue Title; muſt prove it impoſſible, that 'the Church ſhould ever be deceived.

4. Is this a *plain*, or rather is it not an *Impoſſible Rule?* If every one be bound to ſubmit to the Determination of thoſe things, that *in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches* are *left undetermined* by the Word; then every one ſhould be bound to know the Judgment of the *Primitive*, and *Reformed Churches*, as to thoſe things. We ſhould think it well, if Men would be perſwaded to *ſearch the Scriptures*, and to ſubmit to what God hath revealed and made known there to be their Duty; but (according to what you have here laid down) this ſhould not be ſufficient: but every one is alſo bound to *ſearch the Monuments of Antiquity*, to turn over the *Antient Fathers* and *Councils*, and ſo likewiſe to get a View of the whole Body of latter *Confeſſions*, that may inform him of the Judgment of the *Primitive* and *Reformed* Churches. And is not this to *bind heavy Burthens upon Men's Shoulders*, and to make more Sins than are found to be ſo in God's Law? Or will you ſay, that Men are bound to an *Implicite Faith* here, that what you aſſert to have been the Judgment of the *Primitive* and *Reformed* Churches, they muſt believe without more adoe? Or if you will not ſay they are bound to ſuch an *Implicite Faith* in your Word, will you allow them to *ſuſpend the Act of Submiſſion*, to the Determination of Church-Governours, till ſuch time as they can be ſatisfied, that ſuch Determination is agreeable to the *Judgment of the Primitive*, and *Reformed Churches?* Will you give them time, till they can find *Re-ordination* in the like Caſe, reading of *Apocrypha* in the room of God's Word, *&c.* to have been approved and practiſed in the Primitive and Reformed Churches?

5. Is this *a golden*, rather is it not a *leaden Rule?* May it not be turned contrary ways? Was the *Primitive Church* for *kneeling* in the Act of receiving? Were not the *Pſaltzgraves Churches* to be reckoned among the *reformed* Churches? And were they for our *Engliſh Ceremonies?* Do not the *Lutheran*,

649



ran Churches hold ſome things lawful, and indifferent, which in the Judgment of the Church of *England* are unwarrantable? As things indifferent, and lawful in the Judgment of the Church of *England*, are not ſo in the Judgment of ſome other reformed Churches. *I do profeſs plainly* (ſays *Chillingworth*, p. 376.) *that I cannot find any reſt for the Sole of my Foot, but upon this Rock only* (the Bible.) *I ſee plainly and with mine own Eyes, that there are Popes againſt Popes, Councils againſt Councils, ſome Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves, a conſent of Fathers of one Age againſt a conſent of Fathers of another Age, the Church of one Age againſt the Church of another Age.*

6. Is *this Rule*, of the *Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches* indeed *applicable to your eſtabliſhed Rule?* Do you find the one agreeable to the other? Were the Primitive Churches for *impoſing the ſame Liturgy*, the ſame *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, which they yet held undetermined by God's Word? Was it their Judgment, that each Nation, or Province ſhould be tied up to a ſtrict *Uniformity* in ſuch things? Do you find this within the firſt five hundred years? Can you gainſay thoſe Words of yours, (cited, *Rector of Sutton*, *p.* 19. which I think are *pertinent* and *material* here) 'We 'ſee the Primitive Chriſtians did not make ſo much of any Uniformity in 'Rites and Ceremonies; nay I ſcarce think any Churches in the Primitive 'times can be produced, that did exactly in all things obſerve the ſame Cu-'ſtoms: which might be an Argument of Moderation in all, as to theſe 'things, but eſpecially in pretended admirers of the Primitive Church. And yet would you have every one bound to ſubmit to the determination of Church-Governors in ſuch Matters, *whatever his private Judgment be* concerning them? As *Euſebius* notes from *Irenæus* (*l.* 5. *c.* 26. *Engliſh c.* 23.) the Primitive Chriſtians could differ in ſuch Matters, and yet live in Peace. And (ἡ διαφωνία τῆς νηςείας τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τῆς πίςεως συνίςησι.) So *Anicetas* and *Polycarpus* could differ in ſuch Matters, and yet *communicate one with another.* The Primitive Chriſtians retained *contrary Obſervations*, and yet (as *Irenæus* ſaid) *held faſt the bond of Love and Unity.* Can you ever prove that the Primitive Church, or the beſt reformed Churches, have aſſumed a Power of ſuſpending Miniſters from their Office, and of debarring Chriſtians from Communion for ſuch Matters?

Here comes to my Mind that which you ſay, *Unreaſ. of Separat. p.* 14. that *our Reformers proceeded more out of reverence to the Ancient Church, than meer oppoſition to Popery.* (Yet with *King James*, *Defence of the right of Kings*, p. 470. *the Chriſtian Religion reformed*, is as to ſay, *purged and cleanſed of all Popiſh Dregs.*) And p. 17. 'Altho they made the Scripture the only Rule 'of Faith, and rejected all things repugnant thereto; yet they deſigned 'not to make a Transformation of a Church, but a Reformation of it; by

'reducing

650

'reducing it, as near as they could, to that ſtate it was in under the firſt 'Chriſtian Emperors, *&c.* (Agreeable to *Chillingworth*, *p.* 287. § 82.) But whether you took not the hint of diſtinguiſhing the *Transformation* of a Church from the *Reformation* of it, from Arch-Biſhop *Whitgift*, I cannot tell. However *T. C.* (latter part of his *ſecond Reply*, *p.* 172.) could not diſcern it to have any Solidity, but called it *a ſingle ſolid Argument*: ſeeing *Transforming* may be *in part*, as well as *Reforming*. And you have not improved it at all. But what a ſtrange *Aſſertion* is that of yours, *p.* 96. 'That 'there are in effect no new Terms of Communion with this Church, but 'the ſame wich our firſt Reformers owned, and ſuffered Martyrdom for in 'Queen *Mary*'s Days? And will you ſtand to this, that they died *Martyrs for Ceremonies*, and for ſuch Impoſitions, as have thruſt out ſo many Miniſters, that are moſt ready to ſubſcribe to the ſame Truth, for which indeed they laid down their Lives? I had thought, that *J. Rogers* (the *Proto-Martyr* in that Perſecution) had been a *Non-conformiſt*. As there were other *Non-conformiſts* alſo that ſuffered. And can you make the World believe, that they *ſuffered for Conformity?* And did not the Martyrs in Queen *Mary*'s Days ſuffer in one and the ſame Cauſe, whether Conformiſts, or Non-conformiſts? Indeed they agreed well in *Red* (in Blood, and Flames) who before had differed in *Black* and *White*. But as you will have it, *p.* 2. 'Our Church 'ſtands on the ſame Grounds, *&c.* And *p.* 4. 'I would only know, if 'thoſe Terms of Communion which were impoſed by the Martyrs, and o-'ther Reformers, and which are only continued by us, *&c.* I ſay, you would perſuade us, that you are *upon the ſame Grounds* with our firſt Reformers, who were for Reforming according to the Scripture, rejecting all things repugnant thereto, only they would have the Church reduced, as near as they could, to that ſtate it was in, under the firſt Chriſtian Emperors, (*p.* 17.) Now to make this good it lieth on you to prove from Catholick written Tradition, that the *preſent eſtabliſhed Rule* was the Rule for Admiſſion of Miniſters into their Function, and other Church-Members into Communion, *obſerved in thoſe Antient Churches*, or one *as near as could be to it*; and further to make it good, that it is not at all *repugnant to the Scripture-Rule*: Or if you cannot do this, you muſt then grant, that you are gone off from the *Rule of our firſt Reformers*, that is, the *Scripture*, and *thoſe Primitive Churches*, and that the Terms of Communion are not indeed the ſame. *Propter externos ritus diſciplinæ homines pios ferire, neque Domini eſt voluntas, neque purioris Eccleſiæ mos.*

7. Would not ſuch a Rule be *point-blank* contrary to *Scripture-Rule*? If never ſo many Councils, if all the Churches upon Earth determined, that they had ſuch Power, that they could cut off both Miniſters and Members of the Church for Matters *left undetermined by God's Law*, we could not ſub-



mit

mit to such Determination, while we believe the Scripture, which tells us so plainly, that they have no *Power for Destruction, but for Edification.* I subscribe to that of *Panormitan, Magis Laico esse credendum, si ex scripturis loquatur, quam Papæ, si absque verbo Dei agat.* Is not the Scripture-Rule plain here, 1 *Pet.* 5. 3. that the Governours of the Church must not *Lord it over God's Heritage?* And tho the Laity, or common Christian People are *directly* and *properly* intended there; yet no doubt, by just and *undeniable Consequence* it will as well follow, that they are not to *Lord it over the Clergy.* And when *Peter Martyr* sets down the just causes of *separation from Rome*, he gives this for one good Reason; *Because they usurp more Power than the Apostle* Paul *accounted belonging to him.* 2 Cor. 1. *Not as if we had Dominion over your Faith. Quibus verbis testatur fidem nemini subjectam esse, nisi verbo Dei.* And then it would be seriously enquired, whether to require *Assent* and *Consent* to another Book besides the Bible, a *Book in Folio*, and to *all things contained in it*, be not to *have Dominion over Mens Faith?* Many are in doubt here, whose doubts you have not (so far as I can perceive) yet resolved. You your self must grant, that the *Churches of God* have, or should *have no such Custom*, to *tyrannize over the Faith and Consciences of Men* (that is *Lording* it indeed.) As here *Unreas. of Separat. p.* 184. You cite *M. Claude*, allowing, or maintaining *Tyranny over Mens Consciences* to be a justifiable Reason of Separation. And *Le Blanc, p.* 185. And the Confession of *Strasburg, p.* 188. That they look on no human Traditions as condemned in Scripture, but such as are repugnant to the Law of God, and *bind the Consciences of Men.* And *Joh. Crocius (ib.)* Ceremonies forbidden break the Churches Unity; yet its Communion is not to be forsaken for one or two of these, if there be no *Tyranny over the Consciences* of Men. And Bishop *Davenant, p.* 189, 190. Who grants that *Tyranny over Mens Faith and Consciences* would be a sufficient Reason to hinder Communion. As he says *(Sentent. D. Dav. p. 6.)* If some one Church will so *have Dominion over the Faith* of others, that she acknowledgeth none for Brethren, or admits none into Communion with her, *nisi credendi ac loquendi legem ab eadem prius accipiant* —— the Holy Scripture forbids us thus to make our selves the Slaves of any Mortals whosoever they are: our one only Master (Christ) forbids —— *Quæ hæc lege in Communionem alterius Ecclesiæ recipitur, non pacem inde acquirit, sed iniquissimæ servitutis pactionem.* Here I set down a little more than you cites as indeed it was not for your purpose. To these you agree, P. 221. 'Not but that I think there may be a Separation without Sin, from a 'Society retaining the Essentials of a Church: but then I say, the Reason of such 'Separation is, some heinous Error in Doctrine, or some idolatrous Practice in 'Worship, or some *Tyranny over the Consciences of Men*; &c. This *Tyranny* over Consciences with you, is an *imposing of unlawful* things. Which I infer from

652

from thoſe Words, p. 208. *A prudent and due ſubmiſſion in lawful things lies between Tyranny over Mens Conſciences*, and *endleſs Separation*. With Biſhop *Davenant* it is *credendi ac loquendi legem dicere*. Now if this be the Caſe of Non-conformiſt Miniſters, that others would tyrannize over their Conſciences, will it not juſtify their Separation, which is but a *Separation ſecundum quid?* And if you deny this to be their Caſe, be pleaſed to give a ſound and ſolid *Anſwer* to thoſe few Pages of the *ſecond Plea for Peace*, towards the end, *p.* 116, *&c.* *Qui tyrannidem in Chriſtianiſſimum vel uſurpat, vel invehit, ille Chriſtum, quantum poteſt, è ſolio dejicit*, &c. *Amyrald. in Theſ. Salmur*, p. 435. § 22.

8. Will you ſay, every Man is bound (for Peace-ſake) to ſubmit to the Determination of Church-Governours, *whatever his private Judgment may be*, When his Judgment may be, that ſuch a Determination is againſt the Word, tho never ſo many Churches, and Councils judg otherwiſe? And when his Judgment may be, that *ſubmiſſion* to ſuch Determination of Men, would be *real Diſobedience* and acting contrary to the Will of God? If his Conſcience be rightly informed, then he *oppoſeth the Authority of Scripture*, and the *Judgment of God to the Judgment of Men* (as *Chillingworth* ſays, *p.* 309.) which is certainly allowable. If his Conſcience and Judgment be erroneous, yet he muſt *ſuſpend the act of Submiſſion* to ſuch Determination, till he can be better informed: or acting here *againſt his Judgment* and Conſcience (tho erroneous) he would greatly ſin. As ſuppoſe the Governours of the Church to have determined, that we ſhall all *declare our Aſſent* unto that in *Preface* before the *Book of Ordination*, [*That it is evident unto all Men, diligently reading Holy Scripture, and Ancient Authors, that from the Apoſtles time, there have been theſe Orders of Miniſters in Chriſt's Church, Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, as ſeveral Officers.*] You could not have ſubmitted to ſuch Determination, while your Judgment was the ſame, as when you wrote your *Irenicum*. This is evident from what I noted thence, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 41, 66. '*Nothing can be more evident*, than that it roſe not from any *divine Inſtitution*, *&c.* Could you have diſſembled with God and Man for Peace-ſake. (But more of this afterwards.)

But I am thinking, you may poſſibly object, That you ſpeak of things ſuppoſed to *be left undetermin'd*, whereas I Inſtance here, in a matter that the Word determines. Yet I hope this may be more convincing. Let us for this once ſuppoſe, that you could now prove from Scripture, that the *Biſhops Office* is diſtinct from that of *Presbyters*; yet I hope you will grant me, that you could not have ſubmitted to ſuch Determination of the Church, while you believed no ſuch thing. And then I have what I would have. Every Man cannot lawfully ſubmit to the Churches Determination, though it be *according to the Scripture* (that is, ſo long as

653



his Judgment, is the Determination is without, and againſt Scripture) then muſt not the ſame be ſaid, of ſuch Determination, as is *beſides the Scripture?* I know you will not ſay, the *Churches Word is above God's*. So you ſee how this part of your Rule falls ſhort of what you aim at.

One thing you have under this Rule, *Irenic.* p. 124. I ſhould take a little notice of ſome-where, and let me do it here. 'There muſt be a 'Difference made (ſay you) between the Liberty and Freedom of a 'Man's own Judgment, and the Authority of it. So by being under Governours a Man parts with the *Authority of his Judgment*; but you would not have him deprived of the *Liberty* and Freedom of his Judgment; otherwiſe to what purpoſe is this diſtinction brought? Now I would not be ſo uncharitable, as to think, that by *the Liberty of a Mans own Judgment* you could mean a Liberty of profeſſing and declaring contrary to his own Judgment, in Submiſſion to the Determination of Church-Governours, for the Churches Peace. And therefore I ſay, your Rule here is ſhort, and reacheth not to our Caſe.

2. You ſay, in this laſt Concluſion, that *in Matters of meer Order and Decency, every one for the Churches Peace is bound to ſubmit to the Determination of the lawful Governours of the Church.*

Here, 1. This is readily granted, if by *Matters of meer Order and Decency*, you underſtand *Matters of meer Order and Decency*. As you ſeemed to underſtand no more, when you wrote your *Iren.* For there you diſtinguiſh betwixt 'Ceremonies and Matters of meer Decency and Order for Order-'ſake. And you further ſay that Matters of Order and Decency are 'allowable and fitting; but Ceremonies, properly taken for Actions ſig-'nificative, their Lawfulneſs may with better Ground be ſcrupled. (Noted, *Rector of Sutton*, pag. 16.) And thus far (if you pleaſe) you and I are agreed, That *Rules of Order* (not contrary to the end of Order) ſhould be ſubmitted unto; and that not only *for the Churches Peace*, but alſo *in Obedience* to God's Command, *Let all things be done decently and in order.* And to ſuch orderly Determinations, what *Camero* ſays (*pag.* 314. *col.* 1.) may in ſome ſort be applied,—— *Admonitiones quidem ſunt reſpectu Eccleſiæ, at Leges reſpectu Dei; nempe hâc Ratione quod commendavit Eccleſia, Deus impravit.*

2. But I obſerve, that in other Writings ſince your mind is changed, and you have learned now to *confound*, what before you would have *diſtinguiſhed*, that is, your *Rites and Ceremonies*, and *Matters of Order and Decency* (as was noted, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 63.) So you ſay, in your *New Account*, or *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, p. 393. 'We declare, that they 'are appointed only for Order and Decency. And thus now theſe become *meer Matters of Order and Decency* with you. Of which there hath been, and is ſo great diſpute.

Here

654

Here two or three Queſtions come in for your Solution.

1. Whether ſuch Rites and Ceremonies, are Matters of meer Order and Decency?

2. Whether the Governours of the Church have Power to appoint and determine the uſe of ſuch Matters?

3. Whether every one is bound to ſubmit to them, upon ſuch Determination?

I intend not to ſay much upon theſe Queſtions, ſuppoſing they may fall in others Way. And but that you ſeem too reſolved to *hold your own Concluſion*, ſo much hath been written upon theſe Points, that might excuſe us from ſaying more, till what hathbeen publiſhed, be fairly anſwered.

*Queſtion* 1. Whether ſuch *Rites and Ceremonies* are Matters of *meer Order and Decency?*

1. You ſay, and *declare, they are appointed only for Order and Decency.* But not as if the contrary implied a natural Indecency (as was noted, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 63.) whereupon it follows, that you muſt hold them *vainly appointed*, or that the contrary might as well have been appointed; and ſo teach, or tempt People to have hard Thoughts of the Governours of the Church, for appointing and ſo rigorouſly impoſing ſuch Ceremonies, whereby many are deprived of their Miniſters, and of ſome of God's Ordinances; which may ſeem very harſh, if they are only for Order and Decency, and that in ſo low a Degree, that the Worſhip of God might be *as orderly and decently* performed, without them. Would you have the Governours of the Church deprive Miniſters of their Liberty, and others of the Sacraments for no other Cauſe, than their meer Wills?

2. Do you well accord here, with Mr. *R. Hooker*, who ſays, *Our Lord himſelf did that which Cuſtom and long-uſage had made fit; we, that which Fitneſs and great Decency hath made uſual?* You ſeemed, (*Anſwer to ſeveral Treatiſes*, p. 268.) unwilling that any ſhould urge you with that, *Scil.* Then the Apoſtle's way of Worſhip, was not not in it ſelf altogether ſo decent and fit. But if the Ceremonies be in themſelves of ſuch an *indifferent Nature*, that the contrary implieth *no Indecency*, then you cannot ſay, that their *great Decency and Fitneſs* was the Ground of appointing and uſing them. Wherein you and Mr. *Hooker*, appear to be of different Minds. And *kneeling at Communions* with him (*l.* 5. §. 68. *p.* 366.) is *a Geſture of Piety*, which is ſomething more than *meer Decency*.

3. Do you well accord here with the Governours of the Church? You *declare, our Ceremonies are appointed only for Order and Decency.* Whereas they have *declared* them to be *for the due Reverence of Chriſt's holy Myſteries*

*and*

655



*and Sacraments.* And that they are *apt to ſtir up the dull mind of Man to the Remembrance of his Duty to God, by ſome notable and ſpecial Signification, whereby he might be edified.* Will you ſay ſuch things, *are only for Order and Decency*, which are for the *due Reverence* of Chriſt's holy Myſteries, and for ſtirring up the dull mind of Man to the Remembrance of his Duty to God, and for his *Edification?* One would think, that ſuch things ſhould be *good in themſelves*, and not as you ſay, *of an indifferent Nature in themſelves.* Can you imagine things that are *only for Order and Decency* (whoſe contrary are as decent) to be the ſame, or *as good as things for the due Reverence* of Chriſt's holy Myſteries? *&c.* And if a Ceremony be *apt to ſtir up the dull mind of Man* to the Remembrance of his Duty, whereby he may *be edified*, then is it not made *medium excitans*, which you ſay (*Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, p. 354.) *our Church utterly denies?* Is here no *ſpiritual Effect* attributed to Ceremonies, which you can by no means allow, *pag.* 347. But this you are commonly driven to in Diſputation, to ſay, they are *only Matters of Order and Decency*, and ſo would bring them under that Rule or Precept, *Let all things be done decently and in Order*, ] tho they are things of a quite different Nature. Matters of Order and Decency are there commanded *in genere*; but it would be no Tranſgreſſion of that Command, though not one of theſe Ceremonies were appointed, or uſed in the Worſhip of God, nor any others like them.

*Queſt.* 2. Whether the Governours of the Church have Power to appoint and determine the Uſe of ſuch Ceremonies?

Here 1. You ſay, *pag.* 347. 'If Men do aſſert ſo great a Power in the 'Church, as to appoint things for ſpiritual Effects, —— it is all one as to 'ſay, the Church may make new parts of Worſhip. And then the Queſtion is, whether theſe are no *ſpiritual Effects*, if they be *for the due Reverence* of Chriſt's holy Myſteries, and for Men's *Edification?* And as Dr. *Field* ſays, they are adhibited, *to exerciſe great Fervour and Devotion.* And *Hooker*, *Men are edified by Ceremonies when either their Underſtandings are taught ſomewhat whereof in ſuch Actions it behooveth all Men to conſider, or when their minds are ſtirred up to that Reverence, Devotion, and due Regard which in thoſe Caſes ſeemeth requiſite.* If you make them unprofitable, *vile Indifferents*, are not ſuch things unworthy of the Churches Appointment? and if others make them profitable, *edifying Ceremonies*, have you not here denied that the Church hath ſo great Power of her ſelf to appoint ſuch?

2. If Church-Governours have Power, that is, *lawful* Power, or *Authority* from Chriſt, to appoint and command the Uſe of ſuch Ceremonies, then they can ſhew ſo much Power granted them in their *Commiſſion*, or

prove

prove it from the written Law of Christ. Here I remember what you say, *Rational Account*, p. 103. 'Is it in that Place, where he bids the Apostles 'to teach all that he commanded them, that he gives Power to the Church 'to teach more than he commanded? And a little before it, what hath 'he commanded her to do? to add to his Doctrine by making things 'necessary, which he never made to be so? Surely, you cannot think the Church hath any such Power. *In all kind of Grants*, says *Gurney* (Vind. of 2d Com. 45.) *The want of an Affirmative is Negative sufficient.* Then may not Men question, whether the Governours of the Church have such a Power from Christ, till they can prove it?

If [*Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*] doth not imply, that the Governours of the Church may teach and command more, than they have his Word and Warrant for; I can think of no other Text more likely for the purpose, than that, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. *Let all things be done decently and in Order*] Upon which Mr. *F. Mason* grounded [*The Authority of the Church in making Canons and Constitutions concerning things indifferent*, printed 1607.] But here you will fall short too. For (I suppose) the Jews were as well bound to perform the Worship of God *decently* and *in order*; yet that was no Warrant or Allowance for their bringing in *other Rites and Ceremonies* into God's Worship, than what God himself had appointed. And what if Church-Governours forbad the Use of such Ceremonies? Would it be to sin against this Rule? Cannot the Worship of God be performed *decently*, and *in order* without them? *Antecedently* to any Determination of Christ's Governours Men are bound to worship God decently and in Order; but none are so bound to use such Ceremonies in God's Worship, as was hinted before. And that these differ *toto genere* from *Matters of Order and Decency*, may appear, in that if we suppose them approved of God, they are Matters of an higher Nature, than things meerly *decent*, that is, they are *pious* and *religious*, not only *finally*, but *formally*, that a Man would do amiss, that used them only as *decent*, neglecting the *spiritual Signification* of them. And then will it not follow, that if they be not approved and allowed of God, it is worse for Governours to appoint and command them, than if they commanded some simple *indecent thing* in God's Worship? As Superstition, or false Worship (*ceteris paribus*) is worse than a meer Indecency.

3. It would seem, by what we reade, *Gal.* 2. 11, 14. that the Apostle *Peter* had no Authority to appoint the Observation of such things. Yet his Power was as great, as any Church-Governours now can pretend to, with Reason.

4. If Church-Governours have such a Power (as you say of Men's separating upon account of their Scruples, *Unreason. of Separation*, pag. 379.

which

which I answered before, *pag.* 29.) *where can you stop them* from appointing new Ceremonies? And *where will you fix*, as to the use of them? And what Assurance can you give us, that we shall *see an End of them*, that they will never appoint more? Notwithstanding what you say, *p.* 388. *by the same Power* that the Church hath decreed these, she may decree more Rites and Ceremonies, as indifferent as these, and how many, who can tell? And being once decreed, you must think you are bound to submit to such Determination, who are to be *Judges*, whether such or such Ceremonies be rightly determined and appointed? You well know what was said, *Commiss. Account*, p. 71. *Not Inferiours, but Superiours must judg what is convenient and decent.* So, if the Governours of the Church once *judg all those Ancient Rites* of the Christian Church, we ever read of, with many new ones of the Church of *Rome*, (as many as they could refine and purge from Popish Superstition) to be all decent, and convenient, then must you not submit to them all? Though it would be a Sign, that *Religion* was *far past the Meridian in the Church* (as *T. Fuller* says) *where she can hardly be seen, for the length of her own Shadow.* As you plainly declare, from another *p.* 184. that *Separation* is not warranted upon the Account of *bare Ceremonies*, *although many more* were enjoyned; so you must say, that *Submission* to them is a thing not to be denied, *though many more were appointed.* And therefore I say, suppose and grant, that the Governours of the Church have *Power to appoint such Ceremonies*, and you know not where they and you shall stop. And this Power you grant in your subscribing to *the 39 Articles.* For *Art.* 20. saith, *The Church hath Power to decree Rites or Ceremonies* (without limiting any Number.) Tho this Clause was not extant in the Articles of *Edw.* 6, and Q. *Elizabeth.*

Here now I fall upon those two Reasons you give (*Unreas. of Separation*, *p.* 16, 17.) for the *appointing of these Ceremonies.*

1. 'Out of a due Reverence to Antiquity,—— Therefore they retained 'these few Ceremonies as *Badges* of the Respect they bore to the Ancient 'Church. (And yet you cannot deny, but other Ceremonies *more Ancient* than some of these are laid aside; and the most Ancient of these, is so in use with you, as it was not used at first; and was so in use in the Antient Church as it is not in use with you. Such is your *Respect and Reverence here to the Ancient Church.*)

2. 'To manifest the Justice and Equity of the Reformation, by letting 'their Enemies (the Papists) see they did not break Communion with 'them for meer indifferent Things. (As you have it before, *p.* 14.) Our Bi-'shops proceeded (in our Reformation) more out of Reverence to the 'Ancient Church, than meer Opposition to Popery. Now I would be satisfied, whether it might not shew *more Respect and Reverence to Antiquity*,

it

658

if more Ceremonies were retained, and the *more Ancient*, rather than ſuch as came up in latter times, (as *Standing* may be proved before the *Ceremony of Kneeling?*)

And whether there are not *many Ceremonies* in uſe among the Papiſts, capable of having a good ſignification put upon them, and ſo *as innocent* and indifferent as theſe; and therefore for the Reaſon you have given, to be retained, or entertained amongſt us, to *ſhew our Juſtice and Equity* towards them, that we *proceed not in meer oppoſition to Popery*, that we *break not with them about meer indifferent things?* And will you be for *that peaceable Deſign*, for *going as near to Rome* as you can, without Sin? But thus upon your Principles, the Church might be *Reformed* I will not call it, but *Transformed*, (borrowing the Word from you) and become as *Ceremonious* as was the *Jewiſh Church under the Law*. And they that highly applaud ſuch Ceremonies, as mighty *Helps to Devotion*, *&c.* may next tell the World that the *Jewiſh Church* was *priviledged* above the *Chriſtian*, as having more ſuch Helps; (unleſs they have a Face to ſay, that the *Ceremonies of God's appointment* were *no ſuch Helps*, as thoſe *of Man's Inventions.*) And conſequently that latter Churches (which ſome take to have been leſs pure) had ſome Helps, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles were not mindful to ſupply the Primitive Church with.

5. It would ſeem, that if Chriſt had approved of the appointing of ſuch things, he would rather have appointed them himſelf, in his Word, (which would have gained them more repute and eſteem, and might have ended the *diſpute* about them.) There is the *ſame Reaſon* for all Churches to obſerve and practiſe them, as for ours. 'Tis impoſſible for you to aſſign any Reaſon for the Croſs in Baptiſm, *&c. à natura rei*, now, but what would have been as *pleadable* even in the Apoſtles times, and at all times ſince. Then is it not moſt probable, that Chriſt would have made *an univerſal Law* for them, that ſhould equally reſpect all Churches, had it been his Mind to have ſuch things in his Church? Indeed we find, Chriſt hath *inſtituted* what *religious Rites and Ceremonies*, he would have obſerved, in the Sacraments of the New Teſtament. And where he hath determined the matter himſelf, what have Men to do more, than to *ſubmit to his Determination? What can Men do, that come after the King?* None are like to do his work better, or know his Mind better, than himſelf.

6. If the exerting ſuch a Power be found *contrary to many expreſs Commands* in the Word, how can we imagine ſuch a Power conveyed to Church-Governours in any *general Command* there? The Scripture is no where contrary to it ſelf. Conſult *Rom.* 14. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, & *v.* 17, to the end of the Chapter. And *Chap.* 15. 1, 2. Are there ſuch plain Commands in Scripture for *mutual Forbearance*, and againſt *judging*, and *deſpi-*

659



*ſing* one another for ſuch things as God hath not commanded, and againſt *offending the weak*, or *caſting a ſtumbling-Block* in others way, and for preſerving the Peace and Unity of the Church; and can we think it probable, or a thing credible, that Chriſt would have all *ſuch Commands* ſet aſide, meerly for the ſake of things called *indifferent Ceremonies*? Or that the Commands, or Determinations of Church-Governours about ſuch Matters ſhould be of Force againſt the *ſtanding Rules*, and Laws of Chriſt, who is King of his Church? *Matters of Order and Decency* are things of another Nature, neceſſary *in genere*, as I have ſaid before; and yet Men cannot oblige us to this or that particular Order, when it is *repugnant* to that, whereunto it ſhould be *ſubſervient*. Then much leſs is it the Will of Chriſt, that meer *indifferent things* (if no worſe) ſhould take place of great and *neceſſary Duties*. Such indifferent things muſt either be *made neceſſary*, or elſe you muſt ſay, (it cannot be avoided) That the *Churches Peace* may be *broken*, ſound Miniſters, and Chriſtians (that ſcruple the lawfulneſs of them) may be ejected, and caſt out of Communion, or their *Conſciences* may be *enſnared unneceſſarily*. And yet one that ever read his Bible might know ſo much, that the Governours of the Church have other work to do. And as the *ſecond Book of Homilies* ſays (p. 3.) *Better it were, that the Arts of Painting, Plaiſtering, Carving, Graving, and Founding had never been found nor uſed, than one of them whoſe Souls in the ſight of God are ſo precious, ſhould by occaſion of Image or Picture periſh and be loſt:* So indeed better it were, that no ſuch Ceremonies had ever been appointed by Men, than one Soul ſhould be enſnared by them, or one Miniſter or Member of Chriſt ſuffer.

7. I query, If Chriſt had not appointed the Sacraments of the New-Teſtament, whether it had been in the power of Church-Governours to have appointed *waſhing with Water in token*, and to put us in mind of our being waſhed and cleanſed by the Blood of Chriſt, and by the ſanctifying influence and operation of his Spirit; and ſo likewiſe to have appointed the *eating and drinking of Bread and Wine*, as *ſignifying* that our Souls are to feed upon Chriſt, whoſe Body was broken, and whoſe Blood was ſhed for us? Had not theſe been of the ſame Nature, and *as lawful* as the *ſignificant Ceremonies*, which the Church hath taken on her to appoint? Then let the People underſtand the Power of the Church, that if Chriſt had never inſtituted *Baptiſm*, and the *Lord's Supper*, ſhe could yet have in part ſupplied that want with thoſe *ſignificant Ceremonies*, that would have been ſomething like them.

8. If Church-Governours have power to appoint ſuch a Ceremony, as the *Croſs in Baptiſm*, (for Inſtance) then they have power to *add to the thing which God hath commanded*, and to make *new parts of Worſhip*. But *Deut.* 4. 2. & 12. 32. forbids that. You grant *p.* 337. 'That for Men to make new

'parts

'parts of Divine Worſhip is unlawful. For that *is* to ſuppoſe the Scripture 'an imperfect Rule of Worſhip, and that Superſtition is no Fault, '*&c.*

The *Croſs in Baptiſm* is an *Addition*. Tho you ſeem to underſtand the prohibition of adding to the Word, of things *directly repugnant*; yet that is not ſo properly an *Addition*, as an *Abolition*. As one ſays, *Prohibetur hîc additio, non tantùm contrarii, (quæ non tam additio eſt quàm abolitio) ſed etiam diverſi. (v. M. Poli. Synopſ. Crit. in Deut. 4. 2.)* Methinks, we may know what it is to *add*, if we underſtand what it is to *diminiſh*; then as they might not diminiſh, or take away from God's Worſhip *one ſignificant Ceremony* which the Lord had inſtituted, by a *Parity of Reaſon* it would ſeem to follow, that they might not introduce or add *one ſignificant Ceremony* to the Worſhip, God had inſtituted.

The *Croſs in Baptiſm* is made *a new part of Worſhip*. For that which is uſed in God's Worſhip *in ſuch a manner*, and *to ſuch an end*, that there needeth nothing but *Divine Inſtitution*, or God's appointing it to be uſed in that manner, and to that end, to make it a *part of the true Worſhip of God*, that is made a part of God's Worſhip, tho falſly, for want of Divine Inſtitution. Had Chriſt appointed the *Croſs in Baptiſm*, as the Church hath appointed it to be uſed, *in token* that we ſhould not be aſhamed, *&c.* had Chriſt appointed it, by *that Badg to dedicate us to the Service of him that died upon the Croſs*; no doubt it had thus become a part of God's true Worſhip. Here you ſpeak ſhort, *p.* 348. The *Canon* ſays, *It is an honourable Badg, whereby the Infant is dedicated to the Service of*, &c. And what is that, but 'a *Sign from* 'Men to God, to teſtify their Subjection? Which by your own Confeſſion there is *an Act of Worſhip*; and yet you will have it no ſuch thing. *P.* 355. you ſay, 'If Chriſt had inſtituted it with ſuch Promiſes--(then no doubt, *&c.* And I ſay, If Chriſt had inſtituted it *only in token*, that we *ought not to be aſhamed* to confeſs him (which is leſs, than that *hereafter we ſhall not be aſhamed*) had he appointed it *only to ſignify our Duty*, it would yet *no doubt*, have been made a part of Worſhip. And I hope upon ſecond thoughts, you will ſay the ſame.

Some other Paſſages, relating to this Matter, I would have glanced at; but it is time to haſten to an end of this Concluſion I have been ſo long upon.

Yet methinks your *ſlighty Expoſition* of the *ſecond Commandment*, *p.* 141. calls for *one glance* here. Can you find no more in the *Affirmative part* of it, than *a Command to worſhip God without an Image? What is there more?* And are not even *Myſtical Rites and Ceremonies of God's Inſtitution within that Command?* And does not Biſhop *Downham* ſay, *It forbiddeth all Will-Worſhip and Superſtition, whereby Men worſhip God according to their own Inventions?*

There is no dobut, but that Law forbiddeth *other Inventions* of Men, beſides the *worſhipping of Images*, or of *God by Images*. And whether the *common Nature* of the Inventions there forbidden will not be found agreeing to ſome of your Ceremonies, I ſuppoſe will lye fair in others way to take notice of. And ſo you may have a fuller Anſwer to that, *pag.* 338. 'What is neither forbidden, Directly, nor by Conſequence, is lawful, and 'may be practiſed in the Worſhip of God. And it may ſeem a little ſtrange, that ſuch learned Men, as have written for the *Croſs*, and *kneeling in the Act of Receiving*, &c. ſhould endeavour to prove them lawful *by Conſequence* from that Text, *Let all things be done decently*, &c. (whence a more colourable Argument might be drawn *againſt them*. As, if we ſuppoſe ſuch Ceremonies there included, it would imply, that the *Worſhip* of the Apoſtles, and *Primitive Chriſtians*, was not *ſo decent*, wanting theſe Ceremonies, as that of our Church, who obſerve them;) ſtrange it is, I ſay, that they could not rather ſee them forbidden by *plainer Conſequence* in the ſecond Commandment, and ſuch other Texts, as *Deut.* 4. 2. & 12. 32. *Exod.* 30. 32, 33. *Lev.* 10. 1, 2. *Num.* 15. 39, 40. *Ezek.* 44. 2. *Col.* 2. 20, 21, 22. *Mar.* 7. 5, 6, 7.

*Queſt.* 3. Whether every one is bound to ſubmit to ſuch Ceremonies, being appointed and enjoyned by the Governours of the Church?

And here, 1. I cannot yet find, that you have taken off what you had ſaid, *Irenic.* p. 64. (cited *Rector of Sutton*, p. 14.) 'When the Generality 'of thoſe who uſe them, do not uſe them as indifferent, but as neceſſary 'things, it ought to be conſidered, whether in this Caſe ſuch an Uſe be al-'lowable? Now will you allow ſuch Miniſters to forbear the uſe of the Croſs in baptizing, till they can find their People better informed, and brought off from any ſuch Superſtitious Conceit of that Ceremony? For certain it is, very many (ſuch as are ignorant, and moſt backward to be inſtructed) do conceit the *croſſing* of their Children *neceſſary*, as if Baptiſm could not be rightly adminiſtred without it. What if a Miniſter be ſcrupulous, and in doubt, whether by the uſe of the Ceremony he be not guilty of *confirming* them in their *Superſtition*? Will you conſider ſuch, to take off the Scruples you may have occaſioned by this Paſſage?

2. And what will you ſay to them, who cannot believe, but they are *made neceſſary*? When they ſee them as *ſtrictly impoſed* and enjoyned, as if they were *Matters of the higheſt Neceſſity*; this does not in the leaſt inform, or ſatisfy them, that you account them, (for all that) but *indifferent things*. Would not that *conſiderable Perſon*, you once ſpeak of, *Philip Nye*, have ſaid, *Quid verba audiam cum facta videam?* As he ſays, *Our Church-Governours queſtionleſs might have brought in one Rite, or Ceremony*

*Ceremony, with the ſame Liberty to Men's Conſciences, that they have done another,* Scil. *The Croſs, and Surplice,* &c. *with the ſame Liberty, as bowing to the Eaſt or Altar.* As he alſo cites, *A Petition of the Houſe of Commons to King* James, An. 1610. Wherein is as follows, *Miniſters being removed from their Eccleſiaſtical Livings for not conforming in ſome Points, it is a great grief to your Majeſties Subjects, ſeeing the whole People that want Inſtruction are by this means puniſhed.* Here I remember what you ſay of the *Vow Corban,* (p. 340.) and how they *thought their Tradition to over-rule the Law.* Then you can clear your Ceremonies, as *innocent,* and free from any ſuch Crime. And yet it hath ſometimes been known, when *no Surplice, no Service.* And Conformity to the Ceremonies is made ſo neceſſary, that People muſt have *no Miniſters without* it. By which means many Souls are at great wants. That you ſhould hold *it a thing more pleaſing to God,* that the Ceremonies be uſed and kept up, than that the Souls of Men in many places be relieved, and taken care for. And if the Worſhip of God muſt rather be omitted, than the Ceremonies, is not this, *to ſet up Men's Traditions above God's Law,* and Men's Inventions above Divine Inſtitutions? Many cannot be ſatisfied with that you tell them, p. 346. That *theſe Ceremonies are purged from Popiſh Superſtition and Error. And therefore all Opinion of Merit and ſpiritual Efficacy is taken from them; which do make them to be Parts of Divine Worſhip.* They know not that an *Opinion of Merit* is neceſſary to any part of Divine Worſhip. And if you would convince them, that you look on them as no more than *naked,* indifferent *Ceremonies,* they could wiſh, that as you *diſclaim the Opinion of* their *ſpiritual Efficacy* and *neceſſity in Word,* ſo they might ſee that you do *it in deed,* that none may be *deprived of the Means,* that God is wont to make *effectual,* and are ordinarily *neceſſary to Salvation,* for the ſake of ſuch Ceremonies, which you will not ſay are *effectual,* or *neceſſary* thereto. And to go on one ſtep further with you here, to (*p.* 347.) either you muſt grant ſuch Ceremonies are *to be altered,* diſpenſed with *in this Caſe,* or you muſt take them to be *unalterable,* and then (by your own Confeſſion there) you *make them parts of Divine Worſhip.* 'For (as you ſay) 'this ſuppoſes an equal Neceſſity (of them) with that of Divine Inſti-'tution. And if Men muſt be without the Word, and without Sacraments, rather than without your Ceremonies, as ſome have been, and ſtill ordinarily are) then do you not *make them of equal Neceſſity with Divine Inſtitutions,* if the preaching of the Word, and Adminiſtration of Sacraments be ſuch? And thus have you proved (for us) your Ceremonies to be *made parts of Worſhip.* This *Joſias Nichols* complained of long ſince, (*Plea,* &c. *p.* 120.) *That the Reverend Fathers, accounting thoſe things (for which they contend) but meer Trifles, would yet prefer them before the Miniſtry.*

And

And *pag.* 229. ( but miſpaged ) —— *And for not yielding to their Minds, ſuſpended, deprived, and impriſoned their learned and Godly Brethren, and in the mean time preferred the trifling Ceremonies before the weighty work of Preaching.* So that, as Mr. *Calfill* ſaith, The People of God be ſometimes oppreſſed with Traditions and Ceremonies; and for outward Solemnities the inward true Service of God is neglected. —— *And they could not ſee all this while any one thing amiſs, no, not ſo much as the unlearned Miniſtry, or Non-reſidency; but defend all, and maintain all to the utmoſt.*

Now if thus it appears, that the Ceremonies are *made neceſſary*, in being preferred before the Miniſtry of the Word, if *Non-reſidency*, and a *Non-preaching* Miniſtry be counted more tolerable than *Non-conformity*; and if (as you ſay) by making the Ceremonies of *equal neceſſity* with God's Ordinances, they are *made parts of Divine Worſhip*; you will excuſe thoſe that cannot ſubmit to them, unleſs they could be proved of Divine Inſtitution. If they are *things not warranted by the Word* (according to what you have, p. 116.) they ſhould not be *compelled*, they are not bound to uſe them. No Church-Governours upon Earth have ſuch a Power to *bind men to things not warranted by the Word.* If their *Canons* enjoin what *Chriſt's Laws* forbid, (as the making of any new part of Worſhip) they are *ipſo facto* null and void. King *James* ſaith (*Defence of the Right of Kings, p.* 428.) *It is moreover granted, If a King ſhall command any thing directly contrary to God's Word, and tending to the ſubverting of the Church; that Clerics in this Caſe ought not only to diſpence with Subjects for their Obedience, but alſo expreſly to forbid their Obedience. For it is alwayes better to obey God than Man.* And I hope you would not ſet up the Power of any Church-Governour *above the King's* here, and *above Chriſt's.* And what *Epiſcopius* ſaith in defence of *Severed Meetings* ſometimes againſt the will of the Magiſtrate (*Vol.* 1. *Par.* 2. *p.* 56. *col.* 2.) may be applied here to *Non-ſubmiſſion* (in ſuch caſe, as is ſpoken of,) to the Determination of Church-Governous. *Detrectatio autem illa Obedientiæ, non eſt in Obedientia, nedum reſiſtentia, ſed tantum Supremi Juris divini, quod Magiſtratus ſibi injuſte adrogat, aut uſurpat, debita Recognitio.* It ſhould not be called Non-ſubmiſſion to our Governours, but rather a due *Recognition* of the Soveraign Right and Authority of our higheſt Lord.

For haſte I have here thrown things on heaps. A few words now to the third part of your laſt Concluſion.

3. You ſay, 'Wholly as to the Form of Government every one is 'bound to ſubmit to ſuch Determination.

Here I offer to your Conſideration what follows.

1. Whether they that could *ſubmit* to Epiſcopacy *as to their Practice*, that is, live peaceably under it, and obey Governours *in* ( *Licitis & Honeſtis*, ) ſo far

664

far as God's Law allows, ſhould be urged further, to *ſubmit their Judgment* to the Divine, or *Apoſtolical Right* of Epiſcopacy, when determined by Governours, *whatever their private Judgment may be?* Could Biſhop *Cranmer* have declared his Aſſent to ſuch Determination, whoſe Judgment was, *That the Biſhops and Prieſts were not two things, but both one Office in the beginning of Chriſt's Religion*, (as you cite his MS. *Irenic.* p. 392.) could ſuch a Man as Dr. *Holland*, (and I need not tell you what he was) who called Dr *Laud a Schiſmatick*, for *aſſerting the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy*, ſaying, *It was to make a Diviſion betwixt the Engliſh and other Reformed Churches?* Or could *Lud. Capellus* have ſubmitted to ſuch Determination, *That it is evident to every one diligently reading holy Scripture*, &c. who in effect ſays the contrary, *Theſ. Salmur*, p. 8. §. 33. *Neq; verò præſcripto ullo divino definitum eſſe putamus*, &c.

And if the like was determined of Arch-Biſhops, as of Biſhops, I am in ſome doubt from what I meet with in your *Rational Account*, whether you could ſubmit to ſuch Determination. For there *pag.* 298. You ſpeak of it, *as a known and received Truth in the Ancient Church*, — 'That the 'Catholick Church was a Whole conſiſting of Homogeneal Parts, without 'any ſuch Subordination or Dependance. — Here I would be ſatisfied, how you would expound Homogeneal Parts, and ſo you ſeem to expound them, *p.* 300. 'Since the Care and Government of the Church by theſe 'Words of *Cyprian* (*Epiſcopatus unus*) appears to be equally committed to all 'the Biſhops of the Catholick Church. (But then ſhould not all, that have the Care and Government of the Church committed to them, be ſuppoſed to be *Biſhops*; and no one Biſhop above another; otherwiſe how is the *Care and Government of the Church equally committed* to them; how is there *Epiſcopatus unus?* And how doth the Church conſiſt of *Homogeneal Parts?*) And thus will it not follow, that *no Conſtitution higher* than that of ſuch *Biſhops as have the Care and Government of the Church* committed to them, (which you here ſuppoſe to be with *a Parity*) ſhould be *made the Center of Eccleſiaſtical Communion?* And yet more fully, *p.* 302. 'When S. *Cyprian* ſaith, *Epiſcopatus unus eſt*, 'cujus à ſingulis in ſolidum Pars tenetur, *de Unit. Eccleſ.* p. 208. That every 'Part belonging to each Biſhop was held *in ſolidum*, he therein imports that 'full Right and Power which every Biſhop hath over his Charge; and in this 'Speech he compares the Government of the Church to an Eſtate held 'by ſeveral Free-holders, in which every one hath a full Right to that 'Share which belongs to him. Whereas according to your Principles the 'Government of the Church is like a Mannor or Lordſhip, in which the 'ſeveral Inhabitants hold at the beſt but by Copy from the Lord. Now it would be conſidered, whether in theſe Words you have not given *Metropolitan* Churches a ſhake, if not *Dioceſan* Churches too?

2. Whether

665



2. Whether you could *ſubmit*, and *declare your Aſſent*, if lawfull Governours ſhould determine that *Biſhops* were *no Superiour Order* of Divine or *Apoſtolical Inſtitution*, and ſhould require your Aſſent? Would you then diſown, and diſcard ſuch, whom you here maintain to be the *Apoſtles Succeſſours?* For what you ſay, (*Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, Preface, *p.* 89.) we may not think you would *ever be afraid or aſhamed* to own them. For there you tell us, *The Friends of the Church of* England *will not be either afraid, or aſhamed to own her Cauſe.* — 'They muſt not think, 'that we will give up the Cauſe of the Church for it (that is, for Union, 'or the Churches Peace) ſo as to condemn its Conſtitution, *&c.* Then you cannot ſay, that *wholly as to the Form of Government*, every one is bound, for the Churches Peace, to ſubmit to the Determination of Governours, whatever his private Judgment be. Here I have put a Caſe, wherein you could not ſubmit.

3. What if the whole Work of Government, belonging to the Paſtor's Office, was quite taken out of their hand, that they were made *meer Curats of the Biſhop*, and ſuch *Copy-holders*, as muſt hold nothing but *at the Will of their Lord?* Would you have them bound to *acquieſce* in the *publick Deciſion*, without doing any thing towards a Reformation? Should they betrary the Churches Intereſt, *for the Churches Peace?* May they not *endeavour any Alteration*, not ſo much as by complaining to Governours of ſuch Exorbitances of Power, and by humble Petition for Redreſs?

4. Is every one bound to ſubmit (wholly as to the Form of Government) to Governours Determination? Then what if our *Civil Governours*, and the *Eccleſiaſtical* ſhould differ in their *Judgments*, and *Determinations?* I make no queſtion, but you have one time or other met with that of *Sir Francis Knolles* to my Lord Treaſurer *Sir William Cecil*; *Moreover, whereas your Lordſhip ſaid unto me, that the Biſhops have forſaken their claim of Superiority over their Inferiour Brethren (lately) to be by God's Ordinance, and that now they do only claim Superiority from her Majeſties Supream Government: If this be true, then it is requiſite and neceſſary, that my Lord of* Canterbury *do recant and retract his Saying in his Book of the great Volumn againſt* Cartwright, *where he ſaith in plain Words (by the Name of Dr.* Whitgift) *that the Superiority of Biſhops is of God's own Inſtitution; which Saying doth impugn her Majeſties Supream Government directly, and therefore it is to be retracted plainly and truly.* And I find ſomething like this, in that ſmall Tract, called (*Engliſh Puritaniſm*, c. 6. §. 6.) *They hold, that all Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Deans, Officials*, &c. *have their Offices and Functions only by Will and Pleaſure of the King and Civil States of this Realm; and they hold, that whoſoever holdeth that the King may not, without Sin, remove theſe Offices out of the Church,* — *or that theſe Offices are* Jure divino, *and not only or meerly* Jure humano:

666

humano: *That all ſuch deny a principal Part of the King's Supremacy*, which indeed you muſt hold, as to Biſhops, if you can prove them an *Apoſtolical Inſtitution.* Though I know the time when you was of another mind, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 41. 'Will not all theſe things make it ſeem very im-'probable that it ſhould be an Apoſtolical Inſtitution? And *pag.* 40. you believed, that *upon the ſtricteſt Enquiry* it would be found *true, that Jerome, Auſtin, Ambroſe, Sedulius, Primaſius, Theodoret, Theophylact, were all for the Identity of both Name and Order of Biſhops and Presbyters in the Primitive Church.*

Now ſuppoſe the Civil Governours ſhould determine the *Government by Biſhops*, as ſuperiour to the reſt of the Clergy, to be only *jure humano*, that they had Power to alter, if they pleaſed; and ſhould *require Aſſent* to this their Determination: and the *Eccleſiaſticks* on the other hand ſhould be of your mind, reſolving not *to give up the Cauſe of the Church*, or *diſown its Conſtitution*, and ſhould determine it to be *Jure Divino, vel Apoſtolico*, and to be owned of Men, as ſuch: In ſuch a Caſe whether muſt the former, for the Churches Peace, think themſelves *bound to ſubmit* to the Determinations of the latter? Or to which of their Determinations muſt others ſubmit? For none, but ſuch as the *Vicar of Bray*, could ſubmit to both.

Thus I have gone over your three Concluſions which you ſeem to make great account of. What *great Service* they are like to do you, let the Impartial Reader judg.

Inſtead of my *third Concluſion*, I would offer to Conſideration *Chap.* 28 of *Corbet's Kingdom of God* among Men. [*of Submiſſion to Things impoſed by lawful Authority,*] p. 171, &c.

Particularly, *pag.* 173. *Though the Ruler be Judg of what Rules he is to preſcribe; yet the Conſcience of every Subject is to judg with a Judgment of Diſcretion, whether thoſe Rules be agreeable to the Word of God or not, and ſo whether his Conformity thereto be lawful or unlawful. Otherwiſe he muſt act upon blind Obedience*, &c. (with what follows in that Page) And *pag.* 174. *It is much eaſier for Rulers to relax the ſtrictneſs of many Injunctions about matters of ſuppoſed Convenience, than for Subjects to be inlarged from the ſtrictneſs of their Judgment. And bleſſed are they that conſider Conſcience, and load it not with needleſs Burdens, but ſeek to relieve it in its Diſtreſſes.*

You go on with me, *Preface*, p. 74. '*But he urges another Paſſage in the* '*ſame Place*, viz. That if others caſt them wholly out of Communion, 'their Separation is neceſſary.—*That is no more than hath been always* 'ſaid by our Divines in reſpect to the Church of Rome.* But will not this 'equally hold againſt our Church, if it excommunicates thoſe who cannot 'conform?

667



Now may not it be ſaid here (as *Rational Account*, p. 336. beginning) 'They did not voluntarily forſake the Communion of your Church, 'and therefore are no *Schiſmaticks*; but your Carriage and Practices were 'ſuch as forced them to joyn together in a diſtinct Communion from you? 'And may not your own Words (*ibid. p.*356) be returned, *Scil.* 'That by 'your own Confeſſion the preſent Diviſion and Separation lies at your 'door, if it be not made evident, that there were moſt juſt and ſufficient 'Reaſons for your caſting them out of your Communion.—— And ſup-'poſing any Church (though pretending to be never ſo Catholick) doth 'reſtrain her Communion within ſuch narrow and unjuſt Bounds, that 'ſhe declares ſuch excommunicate, who do not approve all ſuch Errors in 'Doctrine and Corruptions in practice, which the Communion of ſuch a 'Church may be liable to, the cauſe of that Diviſion which follows, falls 'upon that Church which exacts thoſe Conditions, &c.

Here it is to be noted, that your own Words (*Irenic.* p. 123, 124.) objected againſt you, (*Rector of Sutton*, pag. 30.) are as follow, 'This '(*Scil.* entring into a diſtinct Society for Worſhip) I do not aſſert to be 'therefore lawful, becauſe ſome things are required, which Men's Con-'ſciences are unſatisfied in; *unleſs* others proceed to *eject* and caſt them 'wholly out of Communion on that account, in which Caſe their Separa-'tion is neceſſary. Whence I inferred, that if Miniſters be wrongfully *ejected*, and wholly caſt out of their publick Miniſtry, for *ſuch things as their Conſciences are not ſatisfied in* (for *not conforming* in unlawful, or ſuſpected Practices) it becomes neceſſary for them to have diſtinct Aſſemblies in this caſe (at leaſt) if there be need of their Miniſtry. Yet I cannot find that you have one word in Anſwer to this. That one would think, either you knew not well what to ſay to the Caſe of the *ejected Non-conformiſts*, or that they were ſo very deſpicable in your Eye, you thought them not worth taking notice of at all.

Now to your Anſwers. (1.) 'Our church doth not caſt any wholly 'out of Communion for meer Scrupulous Non-conformity in ſome parti-'cular Rites.

Yet whatever you ſay here, I doubt, a Man (though he hath his Child lawfully baptized) is not ſecured from the Sentence of Excommunication, if he bring it not to the Church to be *croſſed*. And though a Man would joyn in the Communion, yet if he be not ſatisfied to receive the Sacrament *kneeling*, by the Rules of the Church he is to be debarred from the Sacrament, and then liable to Excommunication for not receiving. And being once *excommunicated*, I would know what parts of publick Worſhip the Church allows him to *communicate in*. Thus there ſeems to be little more than *a Colour and Pretence* in this firſt Anſwer, if the Rules of the Church be followed.

But

But you further ſay, *Preface*, p. 74, 75. (2.) 'The Caſe is vaſtly diffe-'rent, as to the neceſſity of our Separation, upon being wholly caſt out of 'Communion by the Church of *Rome*; and the neceſſity of others ſepara-'ting from us, ſuppoſing a general Excommunication *ipſo facto*, againſt 'thoſe who publickly defame the Orders of the Church, — In the Church 'of *Rome*, we are caſt out with an *Anathema*. —

Now 1. If there be a *neceſſity of our Separation from the Church of Rome*, upon account of that higheſt Cenſure of Excommunication with an *Anathema*, and her *pronouncing us uncapable of Salvation, if we do not return to her Communion*, (as you here ſuppoſe): why then do you allow *a Proteſtant to joyn in ſome parts of Worſhip in the Roman Church, as in hearing Sermons?* &c. (as is plain you do, *pag.* 108.)

2. I ſhall not oppoſe you in this, that the general Excommunication *ipſo facto* in the *Canons*, *lays no Obligation, till it be duly executed.* As you ſay, *pag.* 368, 369. 'General Excommunications although they be *latæ* 'ſententiæ, as the Canoniſts ſpeak, do not affect particular Perſons, until 'the Evidence be notorious, *&c.* — And the Queſtion is, whether 'any Perſon knowing himſelf to be under ſuch Qualifications which in-'cur a Sentence of Excommunication, be bound to execute this Sentence 'upon himſelf? Yet another Queſtion may come in here, *viz.* ſuppoſing ſuch a Sentence unjuſt, though that alone would not *juſtify* Separation, whether yet it may not ſomething *extenuate it?* You are not for extenuating at all, I can bear you witneſs.

3. And may I not ſay, that this is anſwering but *by Halves?* It never reacheth the Caſe of ſo many Miniſters, who have been *wholly caſt out* of their publick Miniſtry. It reacheth not the Caſe of many private Chriſtians, who have been *formally*, and actually *excommunicated* for ſuch Cauſes, as can never be proved by Scripture to deſerve ſuch a Cenſure and Sentence. You know that *Canon* of the Council held at *Agatha* (Can. 2. *Carranza*, fol. 159.) that *if Biſhops excommunicated any unjuſtly, they were to be admoniſhed by other neighbouring Biſhops.* And might not the Admoniſhers have received ſuch into their Communion, whom the other had unjuſtly caſt out? As the Council at *Wormes*, (*Carranza*, fol. 388. Can. 2. cut ſhort there, as I ſuppoſe.) *Can.* 14th is cited in Mr. *B's Church Hiſtory*, p. 275. §. 56. ſaying, *That if Biſhops ſhall excommunicate any wrongfully, or for light Cauſe, and not reſtore them, the Neighbour-Biſhops ſhall take ſuch to their Communion, till the next Synod.* And to my weak underſtanding you ſay nothing here to what you have *Iren.* p. 119, 120. where you fairly clear *Non-conformiſts*, but *lay the Imputation of Schiſm* upon thoſe who *require ſuch Conditions of Communion*, as they cannot conform unto for Conſcience-ſake. The very *requiring of ſuch Conditions*, you would have there to be

no leſs than *an ejecting Men out of Communion.* And therefore I ſhould wonder, if by being *wholly caſt out of Communion*, you then meant only being *excommunicated with an Anathema.* As I doubt not, but Separation is as neceſſary, where one cannot have Communion, with-out *joyning in unlawful or ſuſpected Practices*, as where one is formally *excommunicated*, yea, and if an *Anathema* were annext to the Sentencetoo.

You add, (3.) 'That Author could not poſſibly mean, that there was 'an equal Reaſon in theſe Caſes, when he expreſly determines, that in 'the caſe of our Church, Men are bound in Conſcience to ſubmit to the 'Orders of it; being only about Matters of Decency and Order, and ſuch 'things which in the Judgment of the Primitive and Reformed Churches 'are left undetermined by the Law of God.

Here 1. Be pleaſed to note, that as much as you ſeem taken with, and hug this Conceit of yours, (as you have it once and again here, and likewiſe in your *Conferences*, p. 171. as if you thought it would do you *Knights Service*) yet it remains wholly unproved, that the things impoſed are only *Matters of Decency and Order.* (Still I conceive, that if Man only had appointed ſuch a uſe of *Bread* and *Wine*, to *ſignify* and put us in *remembrance* of Chriſt's Body broken, and his Blood ſhed for us, it had been ſomething *more* than a *meer matter of Decency and Order*, or ſomething *worſe.* And whether the ſame may not be ſaid of the *Sign of the Croſs*, I am in doubt; for they ſeem to be parallel.) And ſo it neither is, nor ever can be proved that *ſuch Impoſition of ſuch things, in the Judgment both of the Primitive, and of all Reformed Churches*, is allowable by God's Law; and that Men are bound to ſubmit to them, whether they are ſatisfied about them, or not.

2. When you ſay, *The Author of Irenicum could not poſſibly mean, that there was an equal Reaſon in theſe Caſes*; I would fain know what thoſe Words mean, *Irenic.* p. 119. (cited *Rector of Sutton*, p. 21.) 'Let Men 'turn and wind themſelves which way they will, by the very ſame Ar'guments that any will prove Separation from the Church of *Rome* lawful; 'becauſe ſhe required unlawful things, as Conditions of her Commu'nion, it will be proved lawful not to conform to any ſuſpected or 'unlawful Practice required by any Church-Governours upon the ſame 'Terms, if the things ſo required be, after ſerious and ſober Enquiry, 'judged unwarrantable by a Man's own Conſcience. Did you not here ſuppoſe ſome Equality in theſe Caſes? And which way did you *wind and turn your ſelf*, to get off from thoſe Arguments?

3. And let me ſay this further, How could you then *poſſibly mean*, that Men ſhould be *bound in Conſcience to ſubmit to ſignificant Ceremonies, as meer Matters of Order and Decency*, when you ſo plainly diſtinguiſhed them, *Iren.*

pag.

pag. 67. And ſay of ſuch Ceremonies, that *their Lawfulneſs may with better ground be ſcrupled*, p. 68. (cited *Rect. of Sutton*, p. 16.) Could you then *poſſibly mean*, that ſuch *Ceremonies*, and *Matters of Order and Decency* were all one? certainly you could not, any further than you might *poſſibly contradict* your ſelf.

*Preface*, p. 76. 'And ſo much ſhall ſerve to clear the Agreement between 'the Rector of *Sutton*, and the Dean of St. *Paul's*.

But if this be all you have to ſay, they are not yet well agreed. And whether there be not the like Diſagreement betwixt your *Rational Account*, and this your *Impartial Account*, where I have compared them, let the Indifferent and *Impartial* Reader judg.

Thus I have gone thorow ſo much of your *Preface*, as I am concerned in.

As you take little notice of me in your *Book*, I have little more to ſay. I would not take others Work out of their hands, who are (by ſo great odds) fitter for it.

The firſt place where I find *Rector of Sutton* cited, is *p.* 95. There you take notice, how far I ſay, we agree with you; but you over-look what follows upon it, that it ſeems very hard, that notwithſtanding you break with us for things you count but *Trifles*, yet would be *Sins* to us. Will you grant, that ſuch as *agree* with you *in all things neceſſary*, may not, ſhould not be *debarred* Communion, by *impoſing things unneceſſary?* Or will you aſſert the contrary, and prove it?

Again, *pag.* 98. You cite *Rector of Sutton*, p. 35. *All the Pariſh-Miniſters are not near ſufficient for ſo populous a City.* And can you ſay, they are ſufficient? Is there no need of more? Why then do you ſay, 'This 'is but a Colour, and Pretence. The caſe is plain, that there is real need of more Miniſters, than are in place. And I deſired to know, whether it was *better that Men ſhould be untaught*, (and ſo periſh for lack of Knowledg) *than taught by* ſuch as the *Non-conformiſts?* Whether the *Souls of Men* are *of no more value*, than our *Ceremonies?* But as yet I have no Anſwer from you, that may ſatisfy.

What you further ſay to me *p.* 137. I have fully anſwered before.

Again, *pag.* 144. You cite a few Words of mine, wich I know to be true of ſome, and pitty them. *And* though it is ſaid, *we would certainly give but bad Quarter to others*; yet I hope if I had been all this time in place, for me, they ſhould have had their Liberty to hear thoſe they were better ſatisfied with, and could profit more by.

*Pag.* 168, 169. You contradict not what I ſaid *Rector of Sutton*, p. 15, 16. Only make a little uſe of it, as ſeem'd to ſerve your purpoſe there; while yet it ſtands good againſt you.

*Pag.*

671



*Pag.* 156. You do not *fully ſet down my meaning*; though it was plain enough, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 42. Neither do you take any notice of what you had ſaid your ſelf, *Irenic.* p. 65. though you there meet with it again. Wherefore I wonder how you could overlook it. If that *Council at Gangra*, had enjoyned the religious uſe of a *peculiar habit*, appropriate to the Service of God, and others had refuſed to ſubmit to it, I queſtion then, whether the Council would not have been the *Schiſmaticks*! (As, whether any, without being guilty of making a Schiſm, can exclude and ſilence Miniſters for *wearing Beards*, or for not obeying ſuch a trifling command as that was, Mr. B, *Church-Hiſtory*, p. 360, 361. §. 55.) But upon that matter of the Council's condemning the followers of *Euſt. Sebaſtenus*, I ſtill query, whether you ought not to make a difference betwixt ſuch as *ſeparated meerly upon pretence of Purity*, while they were indeed defiled with groſs Errors both in Opinion and Practice, (as I there ſhewed;) and ſuch as are *neceſſitated* to withdraw, and cannot otherwiſe *keep their Conſciences pure*? This you ſhould conſider. As *Chillingworth* ſays, p. 282. § 71. *A Murderer can cry*, Not Guilty, *as well as an innocent Perſon, but not ſo truly, nor ſo juſtly.* And *P. Martyr* (Loc. Com. cl. 4. l. 6. p. 894.) *Si quædam partes ab eo* (toto) *ſe dividant, quod vitiari & infici nolint, diſceſſio erit laudabilis.*

The ſeventh and laſt place, where you take notice of me is, *p.* 307. And there I am brought in, as concluding with and for you, about your *National Church.*

But if we are agreed herein, why then do you call that which I ſay of it, (*Rector of Sutton*, p. 20, 21.) *A weak Aſſault*, as you do implicitly, *p.* 303. § 23. *Aſſaulting* (tho never ſo weakly) is not *agreeing*, but quite different, or rather contrary. But there I ſay, 1. That *we will thank you, if you can prove the National Church of* England, *as it is now eſtabliſhed, to ſubſiſt by a Divine Law, and poſitive Inſtitution of Chriſt.* 2. I put it to the queſtion, whether it be not *Schiſmatical, for any National Church to make ſuch Terms of Agreement and Communion*, as are not *agreeable to that ſame Rule*, by which all Chriſtians ought to walk? (And that your Terms are ſuch, is eaſy to prove from *your own Words* there recited) And whether they that *ſo far ſeparate* from ſuch a *dividing* National Church, tho they comply not with *its eſtabliſhed Rule*, may not yet be found *walking by the ſame Rule*, in the true ſence of your Text? Yet theſe things you thought fit to paſs by, and would notwithſtanding perſuade your Readers (that had rather *take your Word*, than be at any pains to compare things together) that *we are agreed*, and *this point is thought fit to be given up.*

And yet I do not deny, but Chriſtians of whatſoever Society, (whether a leſs or greater) ſhould be for uniting ſo far as they can, to preſerve and ſtrengthen the Society, and to promote true Religion and Chriſtianity. So

I agree with you in what you ſay, *p.* 292. 'The beſt way of the Churches 'Preſervation is by an Union of the Members of it; provided the Union be ſuch as doth not overthrow the ends of it. And doubtleſs this is a good and neceſſary *Proviſo*. For that which *overthrows the ends of Union*, is a *wicked Conſpiracy* againſt Chriſt and his Church, rather than true *Chriſtian Unity*, or Concord. But then it ſhould be conſidered, if a National Church ſets down ſuch Terms of Union, as have no tendency to promote the common cauſe of Religion, and true *Intereſt of Chriſtianity*, ſuch terms as are ſure to *cauſe Diſſention*, as evidently tend to *divide*, break and ſhatter the Society, whether the Churches Preſervation be therein truly conſulted, or any way likely to be thereby ſecured? And whether (as Mr. *Corbet* ſays, *Kingdom of God*, &c. p. 155.) *The Conſtitution of the Church ſhould not be ſet as much as may be for the incompaſſing of all true Chriſtians, which indeed makes for its moſt fixed and ample ſtate?* And whether the *taking of a narrower compaſs, be not a fundamental Error in its Policy, and will not always hinder its ſtability and increaſe?*

Thus I think I have ſpoken to all the Paſſages in your Book, wherein I am properly concerned.

Yet am I not at an end of my Task. In your *Preface* you direct me to *three Letters* you have *ſubjoined* to your *Treatiſe*.

*Preface*, p. 76. You ſay, 'There is one thing more which this Author 'takes notice of—— (*Rector of Sutton*, p. 6.) If we are condemned by o-others abroad, we may thank our Friends at home, who have miſrepreſented us to the World, while we have not been allowed to plead for our ſelves. 'Therefore, to give ſatisfaction, as to the Judgment of ſome of the 'moſt eminent and learned Proteſtant Divines abroad, now living, I have 'ſubjoyned to the following Treatiſe, ſome late Letters of theirs, &c.

Now whether you have put theſe Letters in print with the *conſent* of thoſe that wrote them, or by ſome *Law* or Privileg *peculiar to your ſelf*, I know not, nor ſhall I trouble my ſelf to enquire.

And whether they were procured on purpoſe, to grace and ſet off this Book of yours, (as by their Date they appear to have come lately, as you ſay, the firſt written in *September* (80.) The ſecond in *October*. The third in *November*.) this however is not very material. But it is likely ſome may think your *Five Anſwerers confronted* and confounded, with the Authority of theſe *three Letters* of ſome of the *moſt eminent and learned Proteſtant Divines abroad now living*. Yet to tell you my Thoughts, I could not but think thus with my ſelf, That if we had no more cauſe to fear a *French-Army* confuting us by *Club-Law*, than that any *eminent French Proteſtant Divines* would condemn us (if they thorowly examined, and knew our Cauſe) we were ſo far ſafe enough.

Now

Now as to these *Letters*, it concerns not me to descant on the whole: but especially to enquire, and observe, *whether it be not, as I said.* Or as *Calvin* wrote to Dr. *Cox* and his Brethren (*Ep.* 165. as you have it not far from the beginning of your *Book*, *p.* 12.) 'That the state of the Case at 'Frankford, had not been truly represented to him, which made him write 'with greater sharpness than otherwise he would have done. I think, we shall see it plain, That either they had not *the true state of our Case* laid before them, or if they had, then they wrote very much besides it. I suppose their Letters here faithfully translated.

---

## *The First Letter is from Monsieur* Le Moyne.

THo I find a Letter of the same Persons formerly published, wherein it is said, *he thought himself abused, sundry Passages in his Letter*, moderating and regulating the Episcopal Power, *being left out* (*Bonav. Vapul.* p. 80, 81.) Yet I must not suppose any such thing here, unless I could prove it.

But from what is here published, *P.* 404. 'I could not have persuaded my 'self, that there had been so much as one, which had believed, that a Man 'could not be of her Communion, without hazarding his own Salvation. —— 'It is a very strange thing to see them come to that Extream, as to 'believe that a Man cannot be saved in the Church of *England*. And *p.* 408. 'Is it not horrible Impudence, to excommunicate her without Mercy, — 'for them to imagine that they are the only Men in *England* —— that hold 'the Truths necessary to Salvation, as they ought to be held?] From hence is it not plain now, that either he understood not the *matter of difference* betwixt the Conformists, and Non-conformists; or else did here forget it? Had M. *Le Moyne* consulted and perused your Sermon (which possibly was the Occasion of those Writings that M. *de L'Angle* seems to condemn unseen, *p.* 420, 423.) had he only read what you say, *p.* 21. '*I will* '*not make the Difference wider than it is*, —— 1. 'They *unanimously confess* 'they find no Fault with the Doctrine of our Church, and can freely sub- 'scribe to all the Doctrinal Articles. —Well then, *the case is vastly different* 'as to their Separation from us, and our Separation from the Church of 'Rome — 2. *They generally yield*, That our Parochial Churches are true 'Churches —— *They do not deny*, That we have *all the Essentials* of true 'Churches, *true Doctrine*, *true Sacraments*. —— 3. *Many of them declare*, 'that they hold Communion with our Churches to be lawful.] Or had he

seen

ſeen what you write here, *p.* 95. how all your Anſwerers *agree with you in the Doctrine of* the Church of *England*; and as Dr. *Owen* ſays, *we are firmly united* with you *in Confeſſion of the ſame Faith*; had theſe things been in his Eye, ſurely, he could not have written at this Rate, as *if we thought, we were the only Men in* England *that held the Truths neceſſary to Salvation.* So I leave you your ſelf to judg, whether M. *Le Moyne* goes not upon a great Miſtake. Sure I am, that either he, or you, have greatly miſrepreſented us, (as every ordinary Capacity, by comparing what I have here ſet down, may readily diſcern.) If what he ſays of us here be true, what you ſay muſt needs be falſe. Now I do the more willingly *appeal to your Judgment here*, touching theſe things, whereof we are accuſed, becauſe I know you are *expert in the Queſtions* that are amongſt us. Say then, Whether ever any ſuch Controverſie aroſe betwixt the *Conformiſts* and *Non-conformiſts?* Let me hear of one *Non-conformiſt*, that ever aſſerted, *That a Man could not be ſaved in the Communion of the Church of England*, or, that no *Conformiſt* could be ſaved. Yet this learned Profeſſor would have them all to be ſuch. As is too plain from that very *odious Parallel*, which he ſays (*p.*408.) 'One might 'make,—— betwixt them and the *Donatiſts.*—— Betwixt them and thoſe 'of the *Roman* Communion, who have ſo good an Opinion of their own 'Church, that out of her they do not imagine that any one can ever be 'ſaved. (As for his comparing them with *Pope Victor*, ſome will *ſmile* at it, as more fitly agreeing to others that are for *excommunicating* Chriſtians, for meer Non-conformity in matters of Ceremonies. And no better will the Compariſon hold betwixt them and the *Audeans* (or *Anthropomorphites*) as whoſoever reads what Antiquity ſays of them, may perceive. If they were againſt *rich Biſhops*, that is not to the Point. If our Biſhops would be content with their *Riches*, and quit their claim of *Divine Right*, (till it can be proved) or not require our *Acknowledgment* of it, before we *believe* it, nor impoſe ſuch things on us, as we are ſure, and can prove from what they wrote, the Apoſtles would never have impoſed, whoſe *Succeſſors* they pretend to be; then I doubt not we could accord with them. (So that here alſo he *ſhoots wide.*)

And thus alas, by *overdoing*, he hath hitherto *done juſt nothing* for you. I know, Sir, that you to whoſe *Judgment* I here *appeal*, muſt needs acquit us from that *Uncharitableneſs* we are here charged with. Or we are not the Men he ſpeaks of, we are not arrived to that *horrible Impudence to excommunicate* all of your Communion *without Mercy.* We are not like the *Donatiſts*, or thoſe of the *Roman Communion*, not as here we are repreſented. And ſo, if Dr. *Potter*'s word may be taken, we are to be cleared and acquitted from the charge of *Schiſm.* As he ſays (*Anſwer to Charity miſtaken* Sect. 3. p. 75. printed at *Oxford* 1633.) *This clears us*

675.



*from the Imputation of Schism, whose Property it is,* ( *witness the* Donatists *and* Luciferians, ) *to cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates.* Can you find any such *Separatists* amongst those, who yet remain *firmly united to you in the Confession of the same Faith?* We *differ only* ( as I said, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 31. ) *as to certain* ( external ) *accidental Forms, Modes, and Rites*, which the Church of *England* cannot say are *necessary*, and appear to us as things at least to be *suspected*, and yet they are obtruded and imposed with as much Rigor and Strictness, as if they were most *highly necessary*. We doubt not yet, but there are sober and truly pious *Conformists*, whose Consciences do not scruple the Lawfulness of these things. But here I would say, as Dr. *Potter* ( *ibid* p. 76. ) *To him who in simplicity of heart believes* ( them to be lawful ) *and practiseth them, and* withal feareth God and worketh Righteousness, *to him they shall prove Venial. Such a one shall by the Mercy of God, either be delivered from them, or saved with them. But he that against Faith and Conscience, shall go along with the Stream, to profess and practise them, because they are but little Ones; his Case is dangerous, and witout Repentance desperate.* So though the learned Professor compares the present *Dissenters* ( because he knows them not ) with the *Donatists*, I may here borrow an Expression of *Chillingworth*'s ( p. 312. §. 111. ) *Though they did the same Action, yet doing it upon different Grounds, it might in the one merit Applause*, ( or Approbation ) *and in the other Condemnation.*

And what follows in this Letter, *pag.* 408. still proves, that he knows not the Men, or their Principles, whom he here condemns. 'For my 'part ( says he ) as much inclined to Toleration as I am, I cannot for 'all this perswade my self, that it ought to be allowed to those that have 'so little of it for other Men; and who, if they were Masters, would certain-'ly give but bad Quarter to those that depended upon them. To which I shall say but this, One would think, they that would have *Christ's Army consist of Volunteers, and not of press'd Men*, ( as the *Lord of Faulkland* is for it, *pag.* 226. ) they should not be for *giving bad Quarter*; otherwise it could not be expected, that the *Volunteers* would come in very freely to them. One would think, Christians could not expect *better Quarter* from any, than from those, who would have all admitted upon *Catholick Terms.*

Other Passages in this Letter I am not so concerned in. Otherwise his arguing from *Success* and *Providence*, pag. 404. might be questioned. And what is said of the *Confession and Articles of Faith*, p. 405. [ 'Can 'there be any thing more unjust, than to say, that an Instrument which 'God hath heretofore employed for the Instruction of so many People, for 'the Consolation of so many good Men, for the Salvation of so many Belie-

'vers,

6760

'vers, is now become a deſtructive and pernicious Thing?] May not the like be truly ſaid of the *Miniſtry* of many *Non-conformiſts*, both heretofore, and to this preſent day? Hath not God made them *Inſtruments* of the *Converſion and Salvation* of many Souls? *How then is their Miniſtry become a deſtructive and pernicious thing?*

Further, I am confident, you will not, you cannot ſay, as he does, *p.* 406. that 'for the ſpace of 1500 Years, all the Churches in the World 'had no other Government, than Epiſcopal; you have aſſerted the contrary, (as I ſaid, *Rector of Sutton*, p. 41.) and I fear not your retracting here.

But it is likely, what he ſays, *pag.* 409. will pleaſe you. 'For to ſpeak 'the Truth, I do not ſee that their Meetings are of any great Uſe,—— 'when I was at *London*,—— I went to ſeveral of their private Aſſemblies, 'to ſee what way they took for the Inſtruction of the People, and the 'preaching of the Word of God. But I profeſs I was not at all edified 'by it.'

And is this *Truth?* Where was the Fault then? would be my next Queſtion, (if I had opportunity to ſpeak with him.) By this Paſſage, it would ſeem, their *Preaching is of no uſe*, if one cannot be *at all edified* by it. And are ſuch *Diſcourſes*, as thoſe in the *Supplement* to the *morning Exerciſe, of no uſe?* And the Lectures in the *morning Exerciſe* againſt Popery, *of no uſe?* Were the Labours of ſuch worthy, learned, excellent Men as *Ames*, *Brightman*, *Broughton*, *Ball*, *Bradſhaw*, *Cartwright*, *Baynes*, *Cotton*, *Hooker*, *Shepherd*, *Norton*, *Burroughs*, *Hildersham*, (whoſe way of preaching, a worthy *Conformiſt* lately ſaid *he wiſht the preſent Clergy would imitate*) *Hooker*, *Dod*, *Parker*, Dr. *Drake*. Dr. *Kendall*, Dr. *Burgeſs*, &c. and of late, Dr. *Tuckney*, Dr. *Spurſtow*, Dr. *Wilkinſon*, Dr. *Seaman*, Dr. *Manton*, Dr. *Goodwin*, (I ſpeak of ſuch as are dead, whoſe Works follow them, and ſome of which I hope will remain) Dr. *Grew*, Dr. *Bryan*, Dr. *Staunton*, Dr. *Temple*, Dr. *Holmes*, and of ſuch as Mr. *Calamy*, *Corbet*, *Bridges*, *Rich.* and *Joſeph Alleyn*, *Angier*, *Wadſworth*, *Wells*, *Swinock*, *Newcomen*, *Caryl*, *Greenhill*, *Nalton*, *Roe*, *Reyner*, *Jeans*, *Truman*, *A. Jackſon*, *Thomas Adams*, *Ant. Burgeſs*, *Ralph Robinſon*, *John Gibbons*, *Cawton*, *Charnock*, *Theoph. Gale*, &c. *Ot. Haywood*, *J. Shaw*, *Thomas Vincent*, and *Matthew Pool*, (ſo well known by his learned and uſeful *Synopſis Criticor.*) *all of no uſe?* Now they *reſt from their Labours*, yet do not many of their *Works praiſe them in the Gates?* Did he not conſult the Writings of many of the *Non-conformiſts* yet living, *viz.* Dr. *Jacomb*, Dr. *Owen*, Dr. *Bates*, Dr. *Wilkinſon*, Dr. *Collins*, Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *How*, Mr. *Woodbridge*, Mr. *Clarkſon*, Mr. *Sam. Cradock?* But how rare a Preacher muſt we ſuppoſe him to be, who heard *one of the moſt famous Preachers* of the *Non-conformiſts* in *London*, and ſays of what he heard, that it *ſeemed*

*nothing to the purpose?* And yet some *Conformists* have been known to transcribe, and preach some of their Sermons almost *verbatim*. I hope, such thought them to be *of some use*. I say not this of all, or the most. Not only such as the *friendly Debator* would *scorn it*, but many others that could not satisfy themselves to *serve God with that which cost them nothing*. But if there are but two such in a County, Two are some. And then will it not follow, that People should not hear them? For it seems, the best Sermons they are known to preach, are *of no use*.

But a little before these blunt Passages, *p.* 409. he speaks very right, if his Words be rightly expounded, and applied. — 'They should do all 'for a good Agreement; and in the present Conjuncture of Affairs, they 'should understand that there is nothing but a good Re-union, that can 'prevent the Evils with which *England* is threatned.

Thus others at a distance can fore-see *Ruine* coming upon us by our sad *Divisions*; and yet we that are so *near to Ruine*, cannot, or will not see it. The good Lord make those sensible of these things, who might do most to promote a *good Agreement*, and happy Union, and thereby prevent our Ruine and Confusion.

But alas! what *can we do here in comparison of you? Id tantum possumus, quod jure possumus.* We must not sin against Consciences. Certainly, that could not be a *good Agreement*, which is made up by Sin. Would others condescend to our *Weakness* (if they will not have it called *Tenderness* of Conscience) I say, would they condescend, only so far as they might certainly *without Sin*, where we could not submit without sinning; then I doubt not, a *good Agreement* would soon follow. And as the *Lord of Faulkland*, p. 235. *I am confident, that all who receive the Scripture for the only Rule, and believe what is there plain to be only necessary, would (if they truly believed what they profess, and were not led aside either by Prejudice or private Ends; or some Popish Relicks of holding what they have long been taught, or following the Authority of some (by them much esteemed) Persons either alive or dead) soon agree in as much as is necessary, and in concluding no Necessity of agreeing in more; there being no doubt, but it would soon appear plainly what is plain.* To my understanding, there is more in these few Lines to shew the way *to a good Agreement*, than in all your Sermon, and this Book, and Letters taken in too. We readily *agree with you in all that is necessary*; and if you (for your parts) would but *conclude there is no necessity of agreeing in more*, I cannot see what can hinder a *mutual good Agreement*.

*Pag.* 410. 'And seeing the good of the State and Church depends abso-'lutely upon the Union of the People in the Point of Religion, 'one cannot there press an universal Union too much. But it ought to be 'procured by good means.

An

678

An *Union in Religion* may be without *Uniformity in Ceremonies*. You will not own it, that you place *Religion* in theſe, that they are any *parts of Religion*. But the preſſing of ſuch unneceſſary doubtful things upon Men, about which many are and ever will be diſſatisfied, ſeems no good, nor probable means to procure an *Univerſal Union*. That *Prudence* and *Charity* (which this Profeſſor afterwards commends, as *neceſſary in this Work*,) would (in my ſimple Judgment) direct to other Means and Methods.

---

## *Notes upon the Second Letter, from Monſieur* de L'Angle.

ADD *P.* 420. I have not met with ſuch *Writings*, ſaid to be *lately publiſhed, to make Men believe that Communion with the Church of* England *is unlawful, and that the Miniſters cannot permit it to private Perſons without ſinning*. Or if I have ſeen any ſuch, they are quite out of my Mind.

As to the former of theſe, do but allow them to diſtinguiſh, as you do in your *Rational Account*, and they will ſay, They have communion with the Church of *England*, *ſo far as it is a Church*, and very many of them have ordinary Communion in the ſelf-ſame Worſhip, ſo far as it is God's Worſhip. And what is *redundant*, it is not *neceſſary* that they ſhould have Communion in. It is one thing to ſay, Communion with the Church of *England* is *ſimply unlawful*, unlawful *in it ſelf*, and ſo unto all Men; and another, to ſay that Communion in the *Liturgies*, or *Ceremonies* is *unlawful to them*, who cannot yet be ſatisfied that they are lawful.

But we are further ſuppoſed to believe, that Communion with the Church of *England* is *intolerable*, in what follows, that the *Miniſters cannot permit it to private Perſons without ſinning*. Here let every one ſo far as they are called to it, ſpeak for themſelves. For my part, I have never made it any of my Work (God, and Men are Witneſſes) to warn others to take heed how they had Communion with the Church of *England*. I have never told any living Soul, that I ſhould ſin, if I did not forbid their joyning with Parochial Congregations. Rather it ſhould be my *Prayer*, I am ſure it is my *Heart's deſire*, that ſober Conformiſts, and Non-conformiſts might once come to joyn each with other, notwithſtanding their leſſer Differences. But it ſeems, it is not *permitted* to you to have Communion with ſuch at Dr. *O.* and Mr. *B.* tho you may have Communion with others, from whom you differ in greater Matters (both as to your Judgments, and Practices too) while they do but conform. Then is there not ſome ſtrange *ſecret Virtue*, or Inchantment in this *Chain of Conformity?* It can *congregate* the *heterogeneous*, while it *ſeparates* thoſe who are more *homogeneous*.

But

But that this is not the Doctrine of the Non-conformists, that they *cannot permit private Persons to have Communion with you, without sinning*, I am very apt to conclude, because M. *Le Moyne* went to several of their *private Assemblies*, while he was at *London*, and could never hear any such thing from any of them. Otherwise sure, he that could remember the *citing of Pliny*, and *Vitruvius a hundred times* in one Sermon, and tell us of it *five years after*, (tho I doubt his being so busy in *casting up such Accounts*, might be the cause he was *not at all edified* by the Sermon) would not have failed to take notice of such a thing as that, being *more pertinent and material*. And for the same Reason (with others) I cannot believe what follows here, *p.* 423. That 'The Bugbear Words of Tyranny, Oppression, Limbs of Antichrist, are 'continually beaten into the Peoples Ears. If so, M. *Le Moyne* had been as likely as any Person to have catched at them; and then had we heard of them again.

But further, some of us have the very same to say, that this Learned Person says, (*P.* 420, 421.) That 'In frequenting your Assemblies, and preach-'ing too in Congregations that are under the Jurisdiction of the Church of *England*, (when we could enjoy the Privilege, which indeed hath been very rarely) we have thus also *shewn*, *that we do not believe her Communion to be unlawful*.

Add *P.* 422. 'Schism is the most formidable Evil that can befal the 'Church: and for the avoiding of this, Christian Charity obliges all good 'Men to bear with their Brethren in some things, much less tolerable than 'those of which the dispute is, ought to seem, even in the Eyes of those 'that have the most aversion from them.

I thought it would appear, that these eminent, learned Men did not rightly, and fully *understand our case*. So the former speaks, as if we did *excommunicate* the Church of *England without Mercy*; When alas! we are rather under her Excommunication. And this learned Person speaks, as if we had not so much Christian Charity as to *bear with our Brethren*, in the use of a few Ceremonies: but that is not the thing in Question. Many of us (at least) could, and do bear with your Conformity, and joyn with you notwithstanding. But will it not follow from his own Words, That *Christian Charity obliges* you to *bear with* our Non-conformity, yet you will not bear with us? I hope you would be counted *good Men*. Now he says, Christian Charity *obliges all good Men* to bear with their Brethren in *some things much less tolerable, than those of which the dispute is*. The Apostle gives *Timothy* a very solemn Charge (then are not *Bishops* concerned in it, if *Timothy* was a *Bishop?*) 1 Tim. 5. 21. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels*, that thou observe these things, *without preferring one before another, doing nothing by Partiality*. And one of these things,

he

he was to obſerve, we find, v. 17. *Let the Elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double Honour, eſpecially they who labour in the Word and Doctrine.* Yet how many that have been called to the work of the Miniſtry, how many of your Brethren, that would gladly *labour in the work* they have been called unto; and you have been doing them what diſhonour you can, loading them with the charge of *Schiſm* and *unreaſonable Separation*, while you can bear with things *much leſs tolerable* in others? Is this your *Chriſtian Charity?* Or *doing nothing by Partiality?* Are there no Non-conformiſts, that uſe to hear you, when they have Opportunity? I am apt to think there are. And thus they bear with you, as to matters in diſpute, farther than you are ſeen to bear with them.

But this muſt be noted, It is one thing for us to *bear with* your Conformity, and another thing by Word and Deed to *declare our approbation of* Conformity, or to conform meerly becauſe you do ſo. and require us to do ſo, tho we ſuſpect it to be ſinful. As the Lord *Faulkland* (I chuſe oft to ſpeak to you in others Words; becauſe I ſuppoſe if I ſpake the ſame things in my own Words, they would not be ſo much regarded) *Reply* p. 214. *If they have any never ſo ſlight Errors, and which appears ſo to me, which yet they will force me to ſubſcribe to,* (and this you know is *our caſe*, which M. *de L'Angle* ſeems to be ignorant of, or elſe forgot himſelf, and in theſe Lines (I am upon) went quite beſides it) *if I communicate with them, my Aſſent would be damnable, or if they require the ſame ſubſcription to ſome Truths, which yet after my real endeavours in enquiry, appear Errors to me, I doubt not but my refuſal is no way damnable.* Something more you have immediately before. This is home, and anſwers M. *de L'Angle*'s charging us with *committing a very great Sin.*

And where he cites *Calvin*, and *Beza*, *p.* 422. We may well be confident, that they could not have ſubmitted to ſuch Terms, as are put upon us. And if he himſelf had ſubmitted unto all that is required of us, when he was here in *England*, had he ſubmitted to *Re-ordination*, and owned Biſhops, as a diſtinct order from Presbyters, of *Apoſtolical Inſtitution*, I very much queſtion, whether it might not have *drawn the diſpleaſure of his Brethren* upon him, if not *their Cenſure at his return*, as he ſpeaks, *p.* 421.

Add *p.* 423. When I ſee what he ſays of the *Firſt Authors of the Separation*, I cannot but wiſh he had known them. He condemns ſome *Writings*, as *unreaſonable and paſſionate*, poſſibly he may mean our *Anſwers* to your *Sermon*: but then for ought appearing in this Letter, very probably he hath not ſeen them. Yet after all, he comes to plead for Diſſenters. — 'There is a very great number of good Men, whoſe Faith is Pure, and 'whoſe Piety is Sincere, (This Teſtimony I hope is true) and who remain 'ſeparate from you only becauſe their Simplicity is ſurprized, *&c.* And

whe-

whether he ſhould not have had the like *Charity* for very many Miniſters, as he hath for very many of their Hearers, may be a queſtion? 'I rank theſe 'with thoſe weak ones, who ſaid they were not of the Body; and of whom 'St. *Paul* ſaid they were of the Body for all that.

So why may not they, who are of the *ſame Faith*, and have the *ſame Worſhip* for ſubſtance, be acknowledged as *Brethren*, and ſtill owned as in *Communion with the Body*; tho they have not the ſame Ceremonies, which are meer *Shadows*?

But he ſpeaks more fully to the purpoſe, *p.* 424. —— 'And I am ſure, (I wiſh he could make us ſure here) 'That if there were nothing wanting 'to cure it, but the abſtaining from ſome Expreſſions, the quitting ſome 'Ceremonies, and the changing the Colour of ſome Habits, you would re-'ſolve to do that, and ſomething more difficult than that, with great Plea-'ſure.

From hence, as from that earneſt Expreſſion he hath in the Page foregoing, ['In the name of God then, do all that poſſibly you can:] One would eaſily infer, that he was little acquainted with *the Caſe*, he underſtood not where we have ſtuck, what hath thus long hindred our *full Communion* with the Church of *England*. Otherwiſe, for ought I can perceive here, we might have had him pleading for us, that ſuch matters of difference might be quite removed, or at leaſt that they might not be urged, and impoſed. And by what immediately followeth there, *p.* 424. it appears, he is a great Stranger to the *Savoy-Conference*, never truly underſtood how Matters were carried, or who have been the Obſtructors of Union. Had the Non-conformiſts then, or at any time ſince, refuſed to hearken and ſubmit to fair and juſt Propoſals, which would not have pinched at all on that part, which ſhould be kept tender in every one; Then had they been extreamly to blame, and had ſtood very much in their own Light. But God allows us not to break our Peace with him and our own Conſciences, for Peace with Men; neither can true *Piety*, *Zeal*, and *Charity* (three Cardinal Vertues which he commendeth in our Biſhops, and prayeth they may be *increaſed more and more*) require ſo much of us, which is not in our Power to grant and yield unto. But ſeeing (as he ſays afterwards) he ſhould be *paſt all comfort, if he ſhould not ſee ſome new Attempt at leaſt made for the ſucceſs of a work ſo holy, and of ſuch Conſequence, in a time that ſeems ſo proper for it*; and Thouſands more may ſay the like, who truly *prefer Jeruſalem's Welfare* before their *chiefeſt Joy*; I cannot but pray that thoſe, who are chiefly concerned, may have all the *Qualities of the Head and the Heart, which are neceſſary to make them able and willing to contribute to this good Work.*

Upon

6824

## *Upon the Third Letter from Monſieur* Claude.

ADD *P.* 439. Tho he ſays, the diſtinction betwixt the Biſhop and Prieſt is *very Antient*; yet had he been required to own this Diſtinction, as grounded on the Word of God, and to aſſert the Right of Epiſcopacy as of *Apoſtolical Inſtitution*, I very much queſtion, whether this would not have gravelled him.

Add *P.* 440. I believe, there are very few to be found amongſt us, that queſtion the Ordination of all ordained by Biſhops. And many would be glad, if it was permitted, that ſome of you would ſometimes help us in our Meetings.

Where he ſpeaks of Chriſtian Unity and Concord, to my poor underſtanding Mr. *Corbet* ſpeaks more ſoundly, accurately, and diſtinctly.

*P.* 441. He is expreſſly againſt *Tyranny over the Soul, and Mens forcing the Conſcience, by impoſing a neceſſity to believe that which they believe, and to practiſe that which they practiſe* (where we muſt ſuppoſe the things themſelves are not neceſſary.) And according to what follows, in this caſe, 'The ex-'ternal Communion ceaſes of right, and there is not any that is lawful to 'be had any more with ſuch. Was there not need of an *Index Expurgato-rius* here? This makes ſomething for Diſſenters, and pinches ſome where elſe. And what follows that, ['We do not believe that a ſingle difference 'of Government or Diſcipline, nor even a difference of Ceremonies inno-'cent in their own Nature, is a ſufficient occaſion to break the ſacred bond 'of Communion] is little to your purpoſe. I think, a *ſingle difference* of Ceremonies ſhould not break Communion, where there is an *Union in the ſame Faith*, and in things neceſſary. But there is more than a *ſingle difference* of Ceremonies, where *no difference is allowed*, but the ſame Ceremonies are *impoſed* on all, tho one part cannot look on them as *innocent Ceremonies*.

*P.* 442. Speaking of the Proteſtant Churches in *France*, he ſays, 'We 'utterly diſapprove and ſee with Grief, certain Extreams, whereinto ſome 'of the one ſide, and the other do caſt themſelves. The one looking upon 'Epiſcopacy as an order ſo abſolutely neceſſary, that without it there can be 'no Eccleſiaſtical Society, *&c.*

Then according to them, there may be *true Churches*, *true Miniſters*, without Biſhops. And as they are ready to receive Miniſters *Epiſcopally ordained*, (*P.* 440.) ſo they ſhould think it an *Extream*, if we will not own ſuch for Miniſters, as have been *ordained by a Presbytery*, (and that when

there were not Bishops at hand to ordain.) If we will force such to be re-ordained, or will not admit of them as Ministers, this is an *Extream* with them.

Add P. 443. Let not Men *dominier over their Faith and Consciences*, (a thing *destructive to Religion*) and I hope they would not be for *rejecting the Bridle of Discipline*, nor for *shaking off the whole yoke of Government*, nor for *depriving themselves of the Succours which might be drawn out of a general Union, for to strengthen them in the true Faith, and in Due Piety.* But they cannot apprehend, that the things imposed will ever contribute any thing to either of these.

*Pag.* 444. He seems to suppose, they are kept off, only from an Apprehension of some *unpleasant Inconveniencies* in the Episcopal Government: whereas generally it is not the *Government it self*, but some particular *Matters imposed*, which they cannot with a good Conscience submit unto, which causes the distance.

So, add *P.* 447. Tho I have opportunity of conversing with very few, yet I cannot think there is a Man, of all those that believe the *Presbyterian Government* is more agreeable to Scripture-Rule, than our *Prelatical*, that stands off meerly because he cannot have what in his Judgment he prefers, as the *better* Government. So what he says towards the end of the same page, [' The Question here is not about the *esse*, or the *bene esse*, but only ' about the *melius esse*, that they dispute with you —] fully proves, (as I said) that indeed they know not the *true state of our Case*, as we see plainly, he is quite beside the Point we stick at.

Now I look back a little again.

Add *P.* 445. — ' The Bond of Christian Charity doth not only joyn us ' with some of our Brethren, but with all our Brethren, to receive from ' them, and to give them Edification by living together in the same Com-' munion.

Then let the World judg (by this Rule) who have most *Christian Charity*, You, or the Non-conformists. Many of these hear and joyn with you, so far as lawfully they can, and have opportunity; whereas few or none of you will hear, or joyn with them. And yet you are sometimes pleased to call them *Brethren*.

By what follows, it still appears, he understood not the Case, or was beside it. How many that *approve not of the Government*, yet could *submit* to it, did it not require any thing but what they are satisfied is agreeable to the Word? And *both parts* agree, that God's Word ought to be the *Rule of our Worship*. What else is there considerable, I have more fully debated with you before.

Add

684

Add Page 446. 'To imagine that we cannot with a good Conſcience 'be preſent at Aſſemblies, but only when we do fully and generally ap-'prove of all things in them, it is certainly not to know neither the uſe of 'Charity, nor the Laws of Chriſtian Society.

But what if a Church requires Miniſters and Chriſtians to *declare their Approbation* of Things they *cannot approve of*, and to *practiſe* that in the Worſhip of God, which (in their Judgment) *ought not to be practiſed?* Is not this a different Caſe? Would not this be contrary to *true Faith and Piety?* And are not ſuch ſo far cut off from the Communion of that Church, by what he ſays in the beginning of that Page? That is not *allowable* for ſuch to do, which yet they look upon as *tolerable* in others, who are otherwiſe perſwaded in their Minds abut the ſame.

Add *P.* 447. 'I cannot believe that there is any one among them that 'looks upon your Epiſcopacy, or your Diſcipline, or certain Ceremonies which 'you obſerve, as Blots and capital Errors, which hinder a Man from obtain-'ing Salvation. — Something was ſpoken to this, in the Anſwer to the *firſt Letter.* So I ſay ſtill, they are not ſo well ſatisfied about theſe, as to give a *true Aſſent* unto them, and then to *declare their Aſſent*, would be foul *Diſſimulation.* They know not *how eaſily* others get to Heaven by their Conformity: But if they conformed againſt their Conſciences, they know not how they ſhould ever come there *without Repentance.*

Then *pag.* 448. he comes to put in a good Word for us. 'I hope you 'will not be wanting in the Duties of Charity, and the Spirit of Peace, 'and that when the Diſpute ſhall be only of ſome Temperaments, (as if the Diſpute had not been of theſe all this while) 'Or of ſome Ceremo-'nies that are a Stumbling-block (and yet innocent things) and which 'in themſelves are nothing in compariſon of an intire Re-union of your 'Church under your holy Miniſtry, you will make it ſeen that you love 'the Spouſe of your Maſter *more than your ſelves*; and that it is not ſo 'much from your Greatneſs and your Eccleſiaſtical Dignity that you deſire 'to receive your Glory and your Joy, as from your paſtoral Vertues, and 'the ardent care you take of your Flocks.

Now I had thought, that *all the Diſpute* or Difference betwixt you, and the *Non-conformiſts*, had been *only about ſome Ceremonies*, and the like things; I mean, *ſuch as in themſelves are nothing in compariſon of an intire and happy Union.* Were but ſuch things removed, or no ſuch things impoſed, I ſhould hope, you would be ſoon united and agreed. He that underſtands not, that it is the ſtrict and rigorous *impoſing* of ſuch things, (which the Impoſers might lawfully take off, and we cannot lawfully ſubmit to,) *which keeps up the Difference* amongſt us; I ſay, he that underſtands not this, and does not conſider, and ſpeaks to it, he cannot be

A685



ſuppoſed *rightly* to conſider *our Caſe*. And yet how obvious is it, that this is quite over-looked here, not once ſeriouſly debated in any of theſe *three Letters?*

And therefore, as I before *appealed* to you, as *Judg*, whether we were not miſrepreſented here, and you have *judged the matter* already; ſo I ſhall expect, that in the *next Impreſſion* of this your *Impartial Account*, you will take care, theſe *Letters* may be left out. You cannot but know, that they were no *competent Judges* betwixt us, who had only heard *one Part*, and ſeem wholly ignorant what the *other Part* hath to plead for themſelves. Here I remember what you ſay, *Preface*, pag. 35. (of one you ſpeak of there) 'But I muſt do the Author that Right, to declare, 'that before his Death, he was very ſenſible of the Injury he had done 'to ſome worthy Divines,—— and begged God and them pardon for it. So would I have you to do theſe worthy *eminent*, *learned Divines*, and us alſo *that write*, to ſmother their *Letters*, as ſoon as you can, if you do no more. Otherwiſe though I may not live, or have liberty to call you *partial*, the World may account you ſo.

And yet obſerving every one of them to have ſome touch for *Moderation*, *Charity*, *ſome Temperament*, and the like, *if a Council of ſuch* as theſe were called, and once thorowly underſtood our Cauſe, I ſhould not doubt of their *determining* for us. (I have reſpect to what you ſay, *Pref.* p. 77.) And to come nearer to you yet, *If a Council could be called of all the Proteſtant Churches in Chriſtendom* (and let any one of theſe be ſet in the Chair,) that would *indifferently hear* what *both Parts* have to ſay, (I would only exclude ſuch as you, for what you ſay, *Rat. Acc.* p. 292. and 338. 'What 'Juſtice or Reaſon is there, that the Party accuſed, ſhould ſit Judg in their 'own Cauſe? None of the *Parties accuſed* ſeem fit to you, either to be *Judg*, *or Jury*, and with this Caution only) I ſhould not diſtruſt our Cauſe, if ſuch a Council had the hearing of it.

One thing more I learn from theſe *Letters*, *viz.* When I ſee that ſuch *eminent learned Divines* are ſo miſtaken, and drawn to miſrepreſent ſo conſiderable a number of their Brethren, living in the *ſame Age* with them, and not very far *remote* from them; it ſatisfies me how much more eaſy it was for the *Romiſh Party*, being uppermoſt in the World, to *cloud* and obſcure thoſe, who at any time appeared againſt their Errors and Corruptions. As the Lord *Faulkland* (Anſwer to Mr. *Montague*, p. 281) *If he conſider the great Induſtry of his Church in extinguiſhing thoſe whom they have called Hereticks, and alſo their Books, ſo that we know ſcarce any thing of them, but from themſelves (who are too partial to make good Hiſtorians) if he conſider how carefully they ſtop Men's Mouths*——. But here I ſhall ſtop my Pen. So much to theſe Letters.

Yet for a Concluſion, I have a few Words more particularly to you. Now,

*Reverend Sir,*

Be not offended at my plainneſs. I hope 'tis for the Intereſt of the *true Proteſtant Religion*, that I appear in this Cauſe, (how weak, and unworthy ſoever.) My *Charity*, (I ſpeak my heart) is not *confined to a Party*, no, not ſo ſet upon that, which you would call my own; but where I have reaſon to believe others of a *different Perſwaſion* are more holy, and live more like Chriſtians, I would eſteem, love, and honour ſuch more. I am not conſcious to my ſelf of wiſhing you the leaſt harm, or enjoying your Dignities, or Eſtate. Live or dye, ſink or ſwim, however things go with me and mine, I hope, it is my Hearts deſire, it may *go well with the Church* and People of God. I ſee the *Proteſtant Intereſt* in a lamentable, *tottering State*. Methinks, all that are true Friends to it ſhould readily yield, it would *ſtand firmer on ample Ground*, (Terms of Communion of a due latitude) than on ſuch a *narrow Bottom*, that admits not of a Multitude of ſound Chriſtians, who would be firm to it. Yet the latter of theſe you plead zealouſly for, (though it is plain, your dividing them from you, by unneceſſary, *uncatholick* Terms, muſt needs weaken both you, and them.) This I cannot but be ſenſible of, and think it my Duty to lament.

Unleſs the Lord ſhall incline you to a more moderate Courſe, than you have lately taken, in reference to Diſſenters, I know I may expect a *fierce Aſſault* from you. But I know as well what Ground I ſtand on, and further am bold to ſay, you cannot hope for *Succeſs* in this Cauſe, without *firſt deſtroying* a conſiderable part of *your own Works*, (not only pulling down your *Irenicum*, a good *Sconce*, however now ſlighted; but alſo ſadly *battering* and *ſhaking* that goodly Fabrick, your *main Fort*, the *Rational Account* too.) And if you *cauſeleſſly deſtroy*, what you had ſo *well built*, and what is *fortified* and ſtrengthened with ſo much Reaſon, will you not *make your ſelf a Tranſgreſſor?* And may not this add ſomething to the *grief of your Wound* (as *Æſop* has it of the *Eagle*) to be *ſhot with your own Feathers*.

Yet (*Reverend Sir*) I would be more concerned far, on other Accounts for you. *Refrain now from theſe Men, and let them alone*; for *if the Work* wherein they are employed be *God's Work*, then you cannot *ſeek to overthrow it*, but therein you will be *found a Fighter againſt God*. Oh! be well adviſed what you do further this way. You may be under a ſore Temptation, ſeeing your ſelf ſo far *engaged in this Cauſe*, poſſibly you may think, it would be a Diſhonour now to *retract*. But if by this Undertaking of

yours,

A 8685



ſuppoſed *rightly* to conſider *our Caſe*. And yet how obvious is it, that this is quite over-looked here, not once ſeriouſly debated in any of theſe *three Letters?*

And therefore, as I before *appealed* to you, as *Judg*, whether we were not miſrepreſented here, and you have *judged the matter* already; ſo I ſhall expect, that in the *next Impreſſion* of this your *Impartial Account*, you will take care, theſe *Letters* may be left out. You cannot but know, that they were no *competent Judges* betwixt us, who had only heard *one Part*, and ſeem wholly ignorant what the *other Part* hath to plead for themſelves. Here I remember what you ſay, *Preface*, pag. 35. (of one you ſpeak of there) 'But I muſt do the Author that Right, to declare, 'that before his Death, he was very ſenſible of the Injury he had done 'to ſome worthy Divines,—— and begged God and them pardon for it. So would I have you to do theſe worthy *eminent*, *learned Divines*, and us alſo *that write*, to ſmother their *Letters*, as ſoon as you can, if you do no more. Otherwiſe though I may not live, or have liberty to call you *partial*, the World may account you ſo.

And yet obſerving every one of them to have ſome touch for *Moderation*, *Charity*, *ſome Temperament*, and the like, *if a Council of ſuch* as theſe were called, and once thorowly underſtood our Cauſe, I ſhould not doubt of their *determining* for us. (I have reſpect to what you ſay, *Pref.* p 77.) And to come nearer to you yet, *If a Council could be called of all the Proteſtant Churches in Chriſtendom* (and let any one of theſe be ſet in the Chair,) that would *indifferently hear* what *both Parts* have to ſay, (I would only exclude ſuch as you, for what you ſay, *Rat. Acc.* p.292. and 338. 'What 'Juſtice or Reaſon is there, that the Party accuſed, ſhould ſit Judg in their 'own Cauſe? None of the *Parties accuſed* ſeem fit to you, either to be *Judg*, *or Jury*, and with this Caution only) I ſhould not diſtruct our Cauſe, if ſuch a Council had the hearing of it.

One thing more I learn from theſe *Letters*, *viz.* When I ſee that ſuch *eminent learned Divines* are ſo miſtaken, and drawn to miſrepreſent ſo conſiderable a number of their Brethren, living in the *ſame Age* with them, and not very far *remote* from them; it ſatisfies me how much more eaſy it was for the *Romiſh Party*, being uppermoſt in the World, to *cloud* and obſcure thoſe, who at any time appeared againſt their Errors and Corruptions. As the Lord *Faulkland* (Anſwer to Mr. *Montague*, p. 281) *If he conſider the great Induſtry of his Church in extinguiſhing thoſe whom they have called Hereticks, and alſo their Books, ſo that we know ſcarce any thing of them, but from themſelves (who are too partial to make good Hiſtorians) if he conſider how carefully they ſtop Men's Mouths*——. But here I ſhall ſtop my Pen. So much to theſe Letters.

Yet

686

Yet for a Conclusion, I have a few Words more particularly to you. Now,

*Reverend Sir*,

Be not offended at my plainness. I hope 'tis for the Interest of the *true Protestant Religion*, that I appear in this Cause, (how weak, and unworthy soever.) My *Charity*, (I speak my heart) is not *confined to a Party*, no, not so set upon that, which you would call my own; but where I have reason to believe others of a *different Persuasion* are more holy, and live more like Christians, I would esteem, love, and honour such more. I am not conscious to my self of wishing you the least harm, or enjoying your Dignities, or Estate. Live or dye, sink or swim, however things go with me and mine, I hope, it is my Hearts desire, it may *go well with the Church* and People of God. I see the *Protestant Interest* in a lamentable, *tottering State*. Methinks, all that are true Friends to it should readily yield, it would *stand firmer on ample Ground*, (Terms of Communion of a due latitude) than on such a *narrow Bottom*, that admits not of a Multitude of sound Christians, who would be firm to it. Yet the latter of these you plead zealously for, (though it is plain, your dividing them from you, by unnecessary, *unscriptural* Terms, must needs weaken both you, and them.) This I cannot but be sensible of, and think it my Duty to lament.

Unless the Lord shall incline you to a more moderate Course, than you have lately taken, in reference to Dissenters, I know I may expect a *fierce Assault* from you. But I know as well what Ground I stand on, and further am bold to say, you cannot hope for *Success* in this Cause, without *first destroying* a considerable part of *your own Works*, (not only pulling down your *Irenicum*, a good *Sconce*, however now slighted; but also sadly *battering* and *shaking* that goodly Fabrick, your *main Fort*, the *Rational Account* too.) And if you *causelessly destroy*, what you had so *well built*, and what is *fortified* and strengthened with so much Reason, will you not *make your self a Transgressor?* And may not this add something to the *grief of your Wound* (as *Æsop* has it of the *Eagle*) to be *shot with your own Feathers*.

Yet (*Reverend Sir*) I would be more concerned far, on other Accounts for you. *Refrain now from these Men, and let them alone*; for *if the Work* wherein they are employed be *God's Work*, then you cannot *seek to overthrow it*, but therein you will be *found a Fighter against God*. Oh! be well advised what you do further this way. You may be under a sore Temptation, seeing your self so far *engaged in this Cause*, possibly you may think, it would be a Dishonour now to *retract*. But if by this Undertaking of

yours,

yours, you seek to deprive very many Souls of the ordinary means of Salvation, (*forbidding us to preach* to Sinners *that they might be saved*); if thus your set your self in some measure to obstruct the Course of the Gospel; if you so far oppose the Interest of Christ, (your great Lord and Master) if you are against what may be truly called *God's Worship*, and truly *Religious Exercises*, be assured, this shall not be *for your Honour* in the End. For the Lord has said, *Them that honour me, I will honour; and they that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed.* And you know further, our Lord Jesus Christ hath denounced a sad *Wo* unto such as *take away the Key of Knowledg* from Men.

And ought you not to think seriously of it, whether you may not be accounted to have a *special Hand*, in procuring what further Opposition and Sufferings, your poor Brethren may meet withal? If Men should be animated, and set on by your Writings, to *fine, impoverish, imprison*, &c. them (being falsly perswaded, that in *persecuting* them, they should *do God and his Church good Service*) can you be found altogether *clear in this matter?*

And is it not a dangerous thing, not only to *scandalize* and *injure* a Prophet, or *eminent* Saint and *Servant of God*, but even to *offend the least* and weakest *Believer?* Mar. 9. 42. *Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me*, &c. There we see, Christ makes not a *light matter* of it.

You may go on censuring such, as *guilty of as great a Sin as Murder*, when nothing but a *fear of sinning* keeps them from doing as you would have them. But when you have said all you can against them, and tho you will not allow them to be *Members of any Church* upon Earth; yet with all your Authority (was it greater) you cannot *shut them out of Heaven*, you cannot separate them from Christ; As *P. Martyr, Cæterum dicant quicquid velint, numquam efficient, quin credentes & viventes ad præscriptum Verbi Dei sint felices.* The best of it is, they may be happy, for all that you can ever say, or do. Yea, though they were supposed under some *Misapprehensions*, as suppose Conformity lawful in it self; yet their *Non-conformity*, and Non-compliance with you, through a *Conscientious Tenderness* is better, than a *rash*, precipitant, or *dissembling*, hypocritical Conformity would be. And thus endeavouring (as near as they can) to *keep to the Rule* of the holy Scripture, avoiding what they cannot but suspect is not according to that Rule, they may be in a *safer way*, than if they were in *external Communion* with you. And so much I have from my Lord *Faulkland* too, (p. 287.) *By that Rule, whosoever regulates his Life and Doctrine* (or Belief) *I am confident, that though he may mistake Error for Truth in the way, he shall never mistake Hell for Heaven in the End.*

And

And yet further, should you not consider, whether it be not more agreeable to the *Revealed Will* and Mind of Christ, that you should *suffer some Tares* to grow, rather than *pluck up good Corn* with them?

*Reverend Sir*, It having so happened, that poor I have been called out (among others an hundred times fitter) to shew my Opinion touching the Matter you have started, I cannot but think, as I here declare (so far as my Judgment serves) you might have employed your Time, your Learning and Parts to much better purpose, than you have done in this *late Piece of Work*. Surely my Life would be but sad to me, if I could not find more pleasing Work than this, that you have been an Occasion of engaging me in. And yet I hope to have more Comfort in it, at the great day of Accounts, than I can conceive you to have of yours in that Day. If you lay the *Unity of Christians* upon Conformity too, or *Uniformity in doubtful* and *suspected*, if not unlawful Practices, a *general Union* can never be had, or hoped for. If you would make the *way to Heaven narower* than Christ has left it, many will be forced to leave you here.

But now if you would henceforth propose and promote an *Union* amongst Christians upon *Catholick Terms*, we are for you, and would heartily joyn with you. And as that most learned and pious Bishop *Usher* (Serm. of *Univers.* of the Church, and *Unity of Faith*, p. 43, 44.) *If at this day we should take a Survey of the several Professions of Christianity, that have any large Spread in any part of the World, — and should put by the Points wherein they did differ one from another, and gather into one Body the rest of the Articles wherein they all did generally agree; we should find that in those Propositions, which without all Controversy are universally received in the whole Christian World, so much truth is contained as, being joyned with holy Obedience, may be sufficient to bring a Man unto everlasting Salvation. Neither have we cause to doubt, but that as many as do walk according to this Rule,—— Peace shall be upon them, and Mercy*, and upon the *Israel* of God. Now therefore do, as he says, (*ibid.* p. 18.) *We for our parts dare not abridg this Grant, and limit this great Lordship, as we conceive* it may best fit our own turns; *but leave it to his own Latitude, and seek for the Catholick Church, neither in this Part nor in that Piece, but among all* that in every place call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.

And if *a Zeal* for such a general Comprehension, and *happy Union of Christians will* (to use the Words of Mr. *de L'Angle*, p. 424.) 'bring 'down a thousand Blessings of Heaven and Earth upon those that shall 'contribute the most unto it, resolve now, and henceforward to put forth your self this way; Put in for your share of Blessings.

I remember, I concluded my *former writing* with a *Collect* borrowed from you. Here I would say *Amen* to that *Prayer*, with which Dr. *Potter* shuts

up

up his *Answer to Charity mistaken*, [That it would please the Father of Mercies to *take away out of his Church* all Dissention and Discord, all Heresies and *Schisms*, all Abuses and false Doctrines, all Idolatry, *Superstition* and *Tyranny*; and to *unite all Christians in one holy Bond* of Truth and Peace, Faith and Charity; that so with one Mind and one Mouth, we may all joyn in his Service,——] I add no more, but that the *Father of Lights* would so direct your Studies, and Course, that you may *do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth*; which is the Prayer of,

*Reverend Sir,*

Your humble and

faithful Servant,

*John Barrett.*

I more wish, than hope, that of these sad Controversies here will be,

The END.

690

# *Proper Materials drawn from the true and only Way of Concord, &c.*

## QUERY 1.

WHether the Apoſtle *Paul* hath not clearly and fully decided the caſe, againſt cenſuring or deſpiſing one another for things Indifferent? *Rom.* 14, & 15. And if Men will not underſtand, nor ſtand to that Deciſion, whether it ſhould be any wonder, if they will not underſtand, or be ſatisfied with our moſt cogent Arguments? [*Second Plea for Peace.* p. 169. § 75.]

Whether they that ſay, the Apoſtle doth not forbid ſuch Impoſitions there, can ſee Day for Light? 1. Doth he not forbid cenſuring, deſpiſing, and not receiving one another; and command Diſſenters to receive one another? And then muſt he not forbid ſuch Impoſition as is inconſiſtent herewith? 2. Doth he not direct this Command to all the Church of *Rome*, even to the authorized Paſtors and Rulers of the Church, as well as to the People? 3. Was he not a Paſtor and Ruler of that Church as fully authorized as any that ſhould ſucceed? 4. Is not this Scripture (as others) written for a ſtanding Rule, and ſo obligatory to Rulers ſtill? [*ib. p.* 170. § 77.] Did not the Apoſtle ſpeak here by Divine Authority? Are not his Words recorded here, part of Chriſt's Law indited by the Spirit? And may we think, that any that come after him, or to whom he wrote, ſhould have power to contradict or obliterate the ſame? [*Way of Concord, p.* 152.] 5. Do not his Reaſons touch the caſe of all Churches in all Ages, and not only ſome particular Perſons and Caſe? As he argueth from the difference betwixt well-meaning Chriſtians as weak, and ſtrong, as doubting, and as aſſured, as miſtaken, and as in the right, &c. If ſuch weak, miſtaken Chriſtians in ſuch matters ever have been, and ever will be in the Church upon Earth, doth not the reaſon from their caſe and neceſſity ſtill hold? 6. How many great and preſſing moral Reaſons (that all Chriſtians are bound by) are heaped up here? Does he not argue, 1. From Chriſtian love to Brethren. 2. From human Compaſſion to the Weak. 3. From God's own Example, who receiveth ſuch, whom there-

fore we must not reject. 4. From God's Prerogative to judg, and our having no such judging power in such cases. 5. From God's Propriety in his own Servants. 6. From God's Love and Mercy that will uphold such. 7. Because what Men do as to please God, must not be condemned without necessity, but an holy Intention cherished, so it be not in forbidden things. 8. Because Men must not go against Conscience in indifferent things. 9. From Christ's dreadful Judgment which is near, and which we our selves must undergo. 10. From the Sin of laying Stumbling-blocks, and occasions of Offence. 11. From the danger of crossing the end of Christ's Death, destroying Souls for whom he died. 12. Because it will make our Good to be ill spoken of. 13. Because the *Kingdom of God*, or Constitution of Christianity, and the Church, lieth in no such Matters, but *in Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost*. 14. Because *Christ is pleased* in this without the other, and *God accepteth* such. 15. Because such are *approved of Men*, (*i. e.*) This Righteousness, Peace, and holy Joy, without Agreement in such Ceremonies and By-matters, beareth its own Testimony for Approbation to the Judgment of all impartial Men; Humanity and Christianity teach us to love and honour such. 16. From our common Obligation to *live in Peace with all*. 17. From our Obligation to *do all* to the *edifying of one another*. 18. Because *God's Work* else is *destroyed* by us. 19. Because our own lawful Acts are turned into *Sin* when they *hurt another*, and from the Obligation that lieth on us to deny our own *Liberty in Meat*, &c. to avoid the hurting of another that is weak. 20. From the *Damnation* of such as are driven or drawn to act doubtingly. 21. From the special Duty and Mercy of the Strong that should bear the Infirmities of the Weak. 22. From the Example of Christ himself, that *pleased not himself*, and our great Obligation to imitate Christ. 23. From God's Patience to us. 24. Because indeed this is the true way to *Love* and *Unity*, that *with one Mind and one Mouth we may glorify God*, while we lay not our Concord on impossible Terms. 25. Because *Christ receiveth* us, and it is to *God's Glory*, &c. Whether do all these moral Arguments signify no more than this, *receive and tolerate such only till you make Laws against them?* [ibid. p. 150, 151, 152.]

*Query*, 2. Whether Men have any Authority to make Laws about God's Worship, but what Christ hath given them? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 28. §. 36.] And whether it be not against the Mind and Law of Christ (declared Act. 15. 28.) that unnecessary Laws and Burthens in Religion should be made for, and laid upon the Churches? [*ibid.* p. 29, §. 40.] So whether that Determination and Decree of the holy Ghost by the Apostles be not obligatory to all Rulers and Churches upon Earth, even to this day? And whether all that think not themselves wiser, should not

confess

confess that at least it is safe to follow it? [*ibid.* p. 169. §. 74.] If therefore the Pastors shall contrary to that Decree, impose unnecessary things on the Church, not only under the Obligation of Duty, but as a necessary Condition of Church-Communion, whether this be not a tyrannizing over God's Heritage, and usurping a Power never given them? [*ibid.* p. 155. §. 33.]

Q. 3. Whether what God hath left to human Prudence to determine concerning Churches and Church-affairs, be not thus limited by his general Laws, *viz.* That all things be done to Edification (the Circumstances fitted to the end, the Glory of God and the publick Good, the promoting of Truth and Godliness,) that all be done in Love, to the promoting of Love and Unity; and that all be done in order and decently; and as may avoid Offence or Scandal to all, both those without, and those within? [*First Plea for Peace*, p. 19.] Then query,

1. Whether they do well, that unnecessarily bring Subjects into such a Strait, by needless Laws, for Additions in Religion, that the Consciences of Men fearing God must unavoidably be perplexed between a Fear of Treason and Disobedience against Christ, and of Disobedience to their Prince or Pastors? [*Second Plea*, &c. p. 28. §. 38.]

2. Whether it be not more inexcusable to rack and divide the Church by unnecessary Additions in Religion? [*ibid.* §. 39.]

3. Whether it be not against the Will and Law of Christ, to use things otherwise indifferent, scandalously or temptingly, to the ensnaring and endangering of Men's Souls, and the Dishonour of Religion? (*Rom.* 14, & 15. 1 *Cor.* 8.) And whether Men may make Laws about Religion, enjoyning such an evil use of such things? [*ibid.* p. 29. §. 41.]

4. Whether to invent and command new publick-Worship-Ordinances (either in God's Name or their own) co-ordinate, or of the same kind with God's own Worship-Ordinances, which have no peculiar usefulness to one Age or People more than to another, nor any new Reason for them, but what was extant at the making of God's Laws, (whether this) seemeth not to be an Accusation of Christ's Laws of Omission and Defectiveness, and an Usurpation of his Legislative Power? [*ibid.* §. 42.]

5. Whether to forbid Baptism, or to alter it, or make a new Sacrament of Admission, or a new consecrating, or dedicating Symbol for the Solemnization of our Covenant with God, and a new Symbol of the Christian Church, or visible Badge of Christianity, seem not an Usurpation, and Accusation of God's Law, as insufficient? [*ibid.* p. 30. §. 46.]

6. Whether to forbid Preaching, or Prayer or Praise, ordaining Homogeneal Means of our own, seem not an Usurpation, and unlawful? [*ibid.* p. 31. §. 47.]

7. Whe-

693



7. Whether to add more Doctrines, or Articles of Faith, which God hath not revealed in Nature or Scripture, and to require Belief or Profession of Belief of the same, as to any religious End, seem not an Usurpation, and unjust Accusation of God's Word, as insufficient? [*ibid.* p. 29. §. 43.]

8. Whether to alter the Qualifications of Church-members, either forbidding those that Christ requires us to receive, or receiving such as Christ forbiddeth us to receive, be not to contradict his Laws by Usurpation, whether Magistrates, or Pastors do it? [*ibid.* p. 30. §. 45.]

9. Whether to alter the Qualifications of Christ's Ministers, or the nature of their Office, and invent new co-ordinate Officers, seemeth not Usurpation? [*ibid.* p. 31. §. 48.]

10. Whether to overthrow, or prohibit Christ's Church-Discipline, or to set up another (that is not meerly subordinate to it, modally to promote it) seem not an Usurpation? [*ibid.* §. 51.]

11. Whether to forbid Religious Assemblies, or alter their Ends and principal Use, be not to usurp, and to contradict the Laws of Christ? [*ibid.* p. 29. §. 44.]

Q. 4. Whether Rulers ought not to prefer Christ's Interest before their own, and account that their own lieth in preferring His; and should not value conscionable upright Men, though Dissenters in tolerable Cases, and not encourage their unconscionable Enemies? [*Way of Concord, 3d part*, p. 26.] And whether the chief Work of Rulers be not to promote the keeping of God's Laws, and the everlasting Good of Men, and the temporal Good in order thereunto? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 108. *col.* 1. §. 11.] And whether Rulers may command any thing, which will notably do more Harm than Good; or make an unnecessary thing a Means or Occasion of excluding the necessary Worship of God, or preaching of his Gospel [Judgment of *Non-conformists*, in *second Plea*, &c. p. 76. §. 59.] And whether is it more to common Good, and the Interest of Honesty and Conscience, that all the Persons in a Nation be imprisoned, banished, or killed, that dare not swear, say and practise all that is imposed on them, than that *unnecessary Impositions* be altered, or forborn [*Way of Concord*, 3d Part, p. 111, 112.]

Q. 5. Though Magistrates may regulate us in the Circumstances of those Duties, which the Law of Nature or Gospel doth command; yet if on such Pretence they violate, or contradict either the Law of Nature, or the Gospel, and destroy the Duty it self, or its End, whether we are bound in such Cases to obey them? Or whether it be not enough that we patiently suffer? [*First Plea for P.* p. 104.]

Q. 6.

Q. 6. Whether the Kings of *Israel* had Power to forbid the Priests exercising their Office according to God's Law? Or, whether they could change or abrogate their Office? [ *ibid.* p. 20. ] Of *Solomon*'s puting out *Abiathar*, see (*p.* 21.) Whether might they then have put out a lawful Priest, that had not forfeited his Life, or Office? Or might they have put any one in his Place, that had not Right from God, or that was unqualified? Or might they have forbidden the Priests the Work appointed them by God? [ *ibid.* p. 22. ]

Q. 7. Whether such as Christ's Laws empower to ordain others to the Work of the Ministry, have Power from Christ to hinder the Ordination of such as Christ's Laws admit into the Ministry? [ *ibid.* p. 25. ]

Q. 8. Whether the Magistrate (besides the Power of the Temples and Tithes, and publick Maintenance and Liberty also) hath the Power of Ordination, or Degradation, that no Man may be a true Minister without, or contrary to his Consent? [ *Sacrileg. Desert.* p. 11. ] Whether were not many of the *Non-conformist*'s true Pastors of their several Flocks, before they were silenced, and cast out? [ *ibid.* ] And whether did the ejecting them from the Temples and Tithes degrade them, or make them no Pastors to their Flocks? (Though Prudence may require Minister and People to consent to a Dissolution of such a Relation, when they cannot hold it without greater hurt than benefit.) [ *ibid.* ]

Q. 9. Though Princes or Patrons may. 1. Offer meet Pastors to the Ordainers and Consenters to be accepted, when there is just Cause for their Interposition. 2. And may hinder both Ordainers and People from introducing intolerable Men. 3. And when a Peoples Ignorance, Wilfulness, Faction, or Division makes them refuse all that are truely fit for them, may urge them to accept the best, and may possess such of the Temples, and publick Maintenance, and make it consequently to become the Peoples Duty to consent; Yet whether Christ and his Apostles have not settled the Right of Ordination on the Senior Pastors or Bishops, and the Right of consenting in the People? [ *First Plea for P.* p. 33. ] And whether any Man can be the Pastor of a Church *de jure*, or truly *de facto*, against the Church, or Peoples Will, or without their Consent? [ *ibid.* p. 25. ] As the Saying of *Cyprian* is well known, that [ the People have the greatest Power both to chuse a worthy Priest, and to refuse, or forsake the unworthy, *ibid.* p. 77. ] And when in *England* it belongeth, 1. To the Patron to present. 2. To the Bishop to ordain and institute, and therefore to approve and invest. 3. To the People *Jure Divino*, to be free Consenters, 4. And to the Magistrate to protect, and judg who shall be protected or tolerated under him; if these four Parties be for four Ministers, or for three, or two several Men, and cannot agree in one, Whether the culpable

ble Dissenters will not be the Causes of Schism? [*ibid.* p. 50.]

Q. 10. Whether the Churches and Councils were in the right, or no, which for 700, yea 1000 Years held that the calling of a Bishop was null, that had not the Clergies Election, and the Peoples Election or Consent? And if Usurpers should thrust out the Bishops and Conformists, and make themselves our Pastors against our Wills, what would the Bishops think of such? Would they hold it unlawful to separate from such, agreeing with them in Doctrine and Worship. [*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Serm.* p. 27.]

Q. 11. If a lawful Magistrate, or Prince put in place of Pastors, Persons of untried and suspected parts of Fidelity, Whether will his Imposition make such the true Pastors of that Church before and without the Peoples Consent? [*First Plea for P.* p. 55.] If so, then whether might not one *Roman* Emperour have undone all the Churches and Souls in the Empire in a great Degree, by imposing on them insufficient, heretical, or malignant Pastors? [*ibid.* p. 56.] If People were as much under Princes for chusing Guides for their Souls, as a Daughter in her Fathers House is under her Father for the choice of an Husband (which yet we have not seen proved) yet as he can be no Husband to her, without her Consent, (though She culpably deny Consent, *Query*, Whether it be not so here, that they can be no Pastors to People, till they consent? [*Way of Concord.* p. 209. §. 18.] But whether hath God authorized the Magistrate to chuse what Persons every Man in his Dominions shall entrust his Soul to, as the Pastor, whose Conduct he is bound in Conscience to obey? (*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Serm* p. 14.)

Whether shall the People have any Judgment of discerning, or not? If yea, must not the Bounds of it be shewed, without denying the thing, (as if that would bring in all Confusion?) If Usurpers claim the Crown, must not Subjects judg which is the true King, and defend his Right? Will any say, if the People be Judges, they may set up Usurpers, and put down the King? When they are but Discerners of that which is before their Duty, and have no Right to err, or alter the Law and Right, can any dreadful Consequence be proved to follow on it? Or if it be otherwise, must they not be ruled as Brutes? and so must not judg so much as whom they are to obey? Is there any Christian that dare say, that Bishops or Princes are in all things to be obeyed, lest the People be made Judges? (*First Plea for P.* p. 70, 71.)

Q. 12. Whether the Ministerial Office be taken up upon Tryal, or for a time, or during Life (with a Capacity to perform the work?) If the latter be granted, then whether it be any less than [illegible] Horrid Sacrilege, 2. Perfidious Covenant-breaking, 3. Disobedience to God, 4. Cruelty to Souls.

Souls, 5. And unthankfulneſs for great Mercies, if any of us ſhall deſert our undertaken Office (yea, tho a ſilencing *Dioceſan* ſhould forbid us the exerciſe of it, unjuſtly? *Sacriledg. Deſert.* p. 25, 30.]

Q. 13. If Rulers may ſilence the faithful Miniſters of Chriſt, who knoweth where to bound his Obedience to ſuch Silencers? If a 1000 or 2000 faithful Miniſters muſt ceaſe Preaching, when ſo forbidden, why not 3000? why not 4000? If half a Kingdom; can you ſatisfy the Conſciences of the other half, that they muſt not do ſo too; and ſo all Chriſtian Kingdoms conform to *Muſcovy*, when the Prince commandeth it? And if a 1000 or 2000 or 3000 Pariſhes muſt chuſe the apparent hazard of their Souls, and refuſe ſuch helps as Experience certifieth us they greatly need, in Obedience to Man, why muſt not the reſt of the Pariſhes do ſo alſo? May I give away the needful helps to my Salvation, becauſe others have them? ſhould their Salvation ſatisfy me inſtead of mine own? [*Firſt Plea for Peace*, p. 89, 90.] Whether ſhould Men perſuade the poor to famiſh, rather than againſt Law to beg; becauſe if thouſands of them dye of Famine, yet other People are ſupplied? [*ib.* p. 102.]

Q. 14. Whether the antient Chriſtian Paſtors preached not againſt the Will of Princes for 300 years; and after that againſt the Will of Chriſtian Princes (as *Conſtantius*, *Valens*, *Theodoſius junior*, *Valentinian*, &c.). And whether not only Apoſtles ſaid, that God was to be obeyed rather than Men; but ſuch as *Timothy* (who was ordained by Man) were not ſtrictly charged before God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who will judg the living and dead at his appearing, and Kingdom, to preach the Goſpel, and be inſtant in ſeaſon, &c. [*ib.* p. 226, 227.]

Q. 15. Whether any Man hath Authority to forbid a Faithful Miniſter of Chriſt, who forfeiteth not his Office-Power, to perform the Office to which he is ordained? And whether ſuch remain not under a Divine Obligation, which Man's Law cannot diſſolve? Whether it be not right, as Biſhop *Bilſon* ſaith, [If Princes forbid us, we muſt go on with our work?] What if an Interdict ſilence all the Miniſters in a Kingdom? Muſt all obey? What if it ſilence more than can be ſpared without the Churches wrong? And whoſe Laws be they, that would ſo bind? Is it Infidel Princes or only Chriſtians? Is it Papiſts, &c. or only the Orthodox? Muſt God ask leave of Rulers to be worſhipped as God? Hath God made Men judges whether the Goſpel ſhall be preached or not; or whether People ſhall be Saved, or left to periſh in their Ignorance and Sin? And how cometh the Orthodox to be authorized to do Miſchief, or to forbid the needful preaching of the Goſpel, any more than an Heretick? or a Chriſtian more than an Heathen? Is he not bound to do more good than they, rather than authorized to do more hurt? [*Anſw. to Dr. Still. Serm.* p. 84, 85. or 78, 79.]

Q. 16. Where such Sins are made the condition of Miniſtration by Men in Power, as that all the whole Miniſtry of a Kingdom are bound in Conſcience to deny Conſent and Conformity thereto, Whether is it not the duty of all the Miniſtry *in primo inſtanti* to forbear their Miniſterial Office, or of none, (the Reaſon being the ſame to all?) Now if all theſe muſt forbear or lay down their Office, becauſe forbidden by Men to exerciſe it, then is it not in the Power of a Prince to caſt out Chriſtianity when he pleaſeth, and to deny God all publick Worſhip? And muſt we not then ask leave of Rulers, that Chriſt may be Chriſt, and Souls may be ſaved; (as if the Keys of Heaven and Hell were theirs?) [*Firſt Plea for Peace*, p. 114, 115.] But whether muſt not all agree, that to ſilence all the Miniſters of the Nation, is a thing that God hath not given any Man authority to do; becauſe of the neceſſity of their Miniſtry: and conſequently to ſilence any neceſſary Miniſtry at all? [*ib.* p. 223.] And if all muſt not lay down their Miniſtry, why muſt a 1000 or 2000 do it rather than all the reſt? If it be ſaid, the reſt are a competent ſupply to the Churches; how ſhall we be ſure that other Mens ſinning will abſolve the Innocent from their Duty? (As if I were bound to be a Miniſter only till other Men will Sin.) And where can the Wit of Man ever ſet Bounds as to this Matter? Will it not be granted, that if the moſt in *France* conform to Popery, this will not diſoblige all others from the exerciſe of their Miniſtry? And who then can ſay, what thoſe Untruths and Sins are, which a weak and erring Miniſtry may be guilty of, which ſhall ſerve to diſoblige the reſt? And were not this an eaſy way to introduce any Error, by forbidding any but the Defenders of it to Preach? [*Ib.* p. 115, 116.]

Q. 17. Whether God hath authorized the Magiſtrate to chuſe and command in what Words only every Paſtor ſhall publickly pray to God, and what Books and Words of Men he ſhall profeſs Aſſent and Conſent to, and what dedicating Symbols of Chriſtianity he ſhall uſe as engaging in the Chriſtian Covenant; and to command Ceremonies and Modes for Diſſent wherein he ſhall deny Baptiſm and Church-Communion to all Diſſenters, tho the things be taken to be indifferent by the Magiſtrate, and great Sins by the Diſſenters? [*Anſw. to Dr.* Stil. *Serm.* p. 14.]

Q. 18. Whether Paſtors uſurp not Power over one another, when they command all about them to ſpeak to Men from God, or to God from Men in no other Words, but what they (the Uſurpers) ſhall write them down, making Miniſters but Cryers to read their Preſcripts and Proclamations? [*Second Plea*, &c. p. 142.]

Q. 19. Whether any but Volunteers ſhould be taken for true Chriſtians, or admitted to Holy Communion, to receive the Seals of Pardon and Life? [*Way of Concord, third Part*, p. 27. §. 7.] And whether Paſtors of the Churches

706

Churches ſhould be conſtrained to adminiſter Sacraments to any againſt their Conſciences? Whether it be not their Office to be Judges, who is to be baptized, and to communicate? [*Ib.* p. 123.]

Q. 20. If any be urged to take a Re-ordination againſt their Judgments, whether Morals muſt not be preferred before Rituals, and Rituals never ſet againſt them? And whether they ſhould not be of this Mind, that deny the Scriptures to have unchangeably fixed all Rituals; and yet confeſs that Morals are fixedly determined? [*Ib.* p. 214, 215.] Is it not contrary to the temper of the Goſpel, which ever ſubjecteth Ceremonies, Rites and External Orders, to Morals, and to Man's Good, and the great Ends? [*Ib. third Part*, p. 81.]

Q. 21. When the moſt learned, ſober, judicious Conformiſts, differ not at all from us about the Matter it ſelf, to which we deny Conformity; but confeſs it to be unlawful (as to the hardeſt Points of the impoſed Subſcriptions, Oaths, Declarations, and Covenants) and only take the Words in ſuch a Sence, in which we our ſelves could take them, were we perſuaded that it was indeed the true meaning of them; Query hereupon, How it comes to paſs that they, (who are as much as we againſt that Sence which we diſown, and agree with us in the Matter) ſhould deſerve Liberty, Honour and Preferment, for otherwiſe interpreting the Words of the Law, which the Lawgivers themſelves will not interpret; when our Suppoſition, that the Law-makers mean properly as they ſpeak, is taken to deſerve Scorn, Silencing, *&c.* from them that will not expound their Words to us? [*Judgment of Non-conformiſts in Second Plea, &c.* p. 116, 117.] And ſeeing (as thoſe worthy Conformiſts muſt grant) that if the Words of the Laws be properly to be underſtood, and not with their Limitations, then the Conformiſts are in the wrong, and the Non-conformiſts in the right; whether it be not Juſtice to tell the World, and write it on our Croſs, that we are ſilenced, *&c.* becauſe we dare not take Oaths and Covenants impoſed in Terms excluding Limitations and Exceptions, in a limited, excepting Sence, without the Explication of the Law-makers? [*ib.* p. 120, 121.]

Q. 22. Suppoſe the Sin were on the ſilenced Miniſters part, yet if their Errour be in a ſmall and difficult Matter, not deſerving ſilencing (as theirs, *Rom.* 14. about Meats and Days, *&c.*) whether it may not be a far greater Sin, and Schiſm in the Silencers, than in them? [*First Plea for Peace*, p. 116.] Tho the Magiſtrate ought to ſilence all Preachers, that after due Admonition, ſo groſly miſbehave themſelves in Doctrine, Worſhip, or Converſation, as to be the Plagues of the Churches, and to do apparently more hurt than good; yet as to all worthy and able Miniſters, if they commit any Fault, whether they ſhould not be puniſhed only as other Subjects, with ſuch Penalties, as ſhall not by ſilencing or

reſtraint, be a Puniſhment to the Peoples Souls, nor hinder the preaching of the Goſpel of Salvation? Even as if the common Bakers, Brewers, Butchers, Carpenters perform their Work perniciouſly (poyſoning their Bread, Beer, Meat, &c.) they ſhould be forbidden their Trade: but ſhould they for other Faults be ſo puniſhed, that the People be left without Bread, Beer, Meat, and Houſes for their Faults? [*Moral Prognoſtication*, p. 55. § 32.] Are there no fitter means than ſilencing, to correct ſuch Miniſters? Is it not a Sin to ſilence them, when their Miniſtry is needful [*Anſ. to Dr. Stil. Serm.* p. 20, 21.] Had Images been lawfully uſed in Places, or Exerciſes of God's Worſhip; yet whether was it not Inhuman, and Unchriſtian in thoſe Biſhops and Councils, who curſed from Chriſt all that were of a contrary Mind, and ejected, and ſilenced the Diſſenters? [*Way of Concord*, p. 89. § 25.]

Q. 23. Whether do Men take it to be a Sin, to ſuffer us to preach the Goſpel, and a greater Sin than to ſuffer the Inundation of Infidelity, Popery and the reſt, which they ſay is ready to break in upon us? Or whether do they judg our not Subſcribing, Swearing, &c. ſo great a Sin in us, that the Puniſhment laid on Swearers, Drunkards, or Fornicators, will not ſerve turn to avenge it on our ſelves, nor any other of our perſonal Sufferings; unleſs the Souls of many 1000's, and the Proteſtant Religion, and our Poſterity alſo ſuffer for it? [*Sacril. Deſert.* p. 138, 139.]

Q. 24. Whether Magiſtrates, and Paſtors muſt not diſtinguiſh of Errors and Faults of Subjects? whether ſome are not tolerable, and therefore to be tolerated; and ſome intolerable, and therefore not to be tolerated? Whether they that cry out, [One and All, why not one as well as another?] will ſay, If a Foot muſt be cut off for a Gangreen, why not for a Corn? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 162. § 49.]

Q. 25. Whether he that knows himſelf to be a Man, and a Sinner, and is penitently conſcious what abundance of greater Sins he hath than the conſcientious Forbearance of a Ceremony, or needleſs Oath, or Subſcription, will not be very tender of his uſage of others for ſuch Matters? [*Ib.* p. 163. § 52.]

Q. 26. Whether a tender Conſcience be not the ſame with what God hath promiſed, even an Heart of Fleſh, a Conſcience that hath Spiritual Life and Feeling, and is ſenſible of the evil of the leaſt Sin? [*Ib.* p. 163, 164. § 54.] And whether the impoſing of unneceſſary Subſcriptions, Profeſſions, or Oaths, be not the way to fill the Church with Men that are not troubled with tender Conſciences, and that have no fear of God, nor of Sin? And whether he that believeth, that ever he ſhall be judged by the great Paſtor of the Flock, ſhould not be as much at leaſt afraid of

letting

letting in such Presbyters into the Church, as of enduring holy faithful Men, that fear a Lie, or Oath, or Superstition? [*Ib.* p. 164. § 55.]

Q. 27. Whether every Man hath not Sins of Ignorance, and some degree of Error? And whether have not some Faithful Men more than others? And do they not take some Sins to be Duties, or no Sins? [*Way of Concord*, p. 181.] And whether he that maketh a Canon to Silence, or Excommunicate, or cast out Men for a Fault common to all Preachers, Christians and Men, doth not make a Canon to Silence or cast out all Preachers, Pastors, and Men? And if we deserve to be cast out of the Church and Kingdom in the case of Non-conformity to the present Impositions, whether it be not either because we are weak, or ignorant, or wicked? And whether we may not here profess to the World our joyful consent to be silenced and banished, on condition that the *Diocesans* will effectually provide, that none more Weak, more Ignorant, and more Wicked, shall be tolerated in Church and Kingdom when we are gone, and that no detriment shall befal his Majesties Dominions by the diminution of his Subjects? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 164, 165. § 57, 58.]

Q. 28. Whether a diversity of Circumstances and indifferent Modes in divers Churches or Parishes, and sometimes in the same Church, be such a dreadful Mischief, as some frightful Pastors would make themselves and others believe? Or whether it be to be compared with the consequents of unnecessary Impositions? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 158. § 44.]

Q. 29. Whether was there no difference in their Forms or Modes of Worship, between *Basil* at *Cæsarea*, and the Church at *Neocæserea*; and between *Rome* and *Millane*; and between almost all the Catholick Bishops for many hundred years? And whether is there not so now, one Parish-Minister praying freely in the Pulpit before and after Sermon; another by a Form; a third bidding Prayer before, *&c.* [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 34.] And is not difference in many points of Doctrine as great a difference, as using and not using some of the Liturgick Forms and Ceremonies? [*Ans. to Dr. Stil. Serm.* p. 46, or 48.]

Q. 30. Whether the present full Conformity required, will ever be the Terms of the full desirable Unity and Concord of the Christian Protestants in his Majesties Dominions? Whether it be not morally impossible to bring all good Christians Judgments to hold all this Conformity lawful? And whether it be not as impossible to bring them all to conform to that which they judg unlawful? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 172. § 80.] Whether there is a greater difference of Visages, than of Intellectual Apprehensions? [*Way of Concord*, p. 81.] And while there will be difference in Judgment (even among Christians, and good and tolerable Christians) whether can other be expected, than that there will be also difference in Professions, and

in

in Practice? Will not honeſt Mens Profeſſions and Practices agree in the main with their Judgments? Whether then is it to be expected, that if ſome Men think that long doctrinal Confeſſions, formed in Men's private Words, or Liturgies, or other humane Forms have nothing in them untrue, or evil, or which all Men may not conſent to, therefore all others muſt think ſo too, and ſay as they? Who can think that in many thouſand uncertain Words, all Men can and muſt be of the ſame Mind, and approve them all alike? Or that honeſt Men can lye, and ſay that they aſſent to what they do not? (*ibid.* p. 88.)

Q. 31. If Men in all theſe muſt be brought to Uniformity and Practiſing in the ſame Mode, whether muſt it not be either by Argument and Perſwaſion, or by Force? And whether it be not certain, that the firſt will never do it? Beſides a multitude of Reaſons, whether doth not many hundred Years experience prove, that all Chriſtians will never be in all things of a mind about lawful and unlawful, Duty and Sin? And whether it be not as certain, that Force will never do it? Will a ſound Believer ſell his Soul to ſave his Fleſh, or hazard Heaven by wilful Sin to ſave his Intereſt on Earth? (*ibid.* p. 89, 90.)

Q. 32. Whether in regard of the diverſity of mental Capacities and Apprehenſions, the beſt will ever agree in any, but few, plain, and certain things? (*Way of Concord*, 3d Part, *p.* 109.) And,

Q. 33. Whether univerſal Concord may not take in moſt of the differing Parties, though not as ſuch, by receiving any of their Errors; yet as Chriſtians, who agree in the common Eſſentials of Faith and Piety? And whether we ſhould not hold eſſential Unity with all that hold the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity; though with thoſe that hold Integrals more purely, we are to have more full and nearer Concord than the reſt, that have more Errors? (*ib.* p. 72.) Whether Chriſtians ought not to bear with one another (without having their Affections alienated from, and much more without perſecuting one another) in greater Matters than moſt of the diſſenting Parties diſagree in? Whether Chriſtians of as different Principles may not, yea, and ought not yet to love each other, and live in Peace? (*Sacril. Deſert.* p. 7, 8, 9.) Whether the *Novatians* for many Ages were not tolerated by the wiſeſt and godlieſt Emperours and Biſhops? (*ibid.* p. 14.)

Q. 34. Whether the Terms of Church-Communion muſt not be ſuch as take in all that Chriſt taketh in, and would have us take in, (*i. e.*) All that are fit for Church-Communion? And whether they ſhould not be ſuch Terms as all true Chriſtians (fit for ſuch Church-Communion) if impoſed, would have united in, in all Ages and Places of the Church ſince the days of Chriſt till now? And whether thoſe Terms that would have divided the Church, are fit means to unite it? Or can we think

that

that the Church ſhould now unite upon ſuch Terms, as it never united before? (*Second Plea for P.* p. 152, 153.)

Q. 35. Whether Chriſt himſelf hath not inſtituted the Baptiſmal Covenant (*Mat.* 28. 19.) to be the Title of viſible Members of the Church, and the Symbol by which they ſhall be notified? and hath not commanded all the baptized, as Chriſtians, to love each other as themſelves; and though weak in Faith, to receive one another, as Chriſt receiveth us, but not to doubtful Diſputations, and ſo far as they have attained, to walk by the ſame Rule (of Love and Peace) and not to deſpiſe or judg each other for tolerable Differences? And whether any mortal Man hath Power to abrogate theſe Terms of Church-union and Concord which Chriſt hath made? (*Firſt Plea for P.* p. 34.)

Q. 36. Whether Chriſt, who made the Baptiſmal Covenant, the Teſt and ſtanding Terms of Entrance, did ſet up Paſtors over his Churches, to make new and ſtricter Terms and Laws; or to preſerve Concord on the Terms that he had founded it, and to ſee that Men lived in Unity and Piety according to the Terms of the Covenant, which they had entered? (*Second Plea for P.* p. 154.) And when they have as Miniſters, not as Lords, received Men on Chriſt's Terms, whether they may excommunicate and turn them out again for want of more, *or only* for violating theſe? (*ibid.* p. 155.)

Q. 37. Whether it be not a ſtrange Contrariety of ſome to themſelves, who judg that all Infants of Heathens, Jews, Turks, or wicked Men, are without Exception to be taken into the Church, if any ignorant Chriſtian will but offer them, and ſay over a few Words; and the Adult alſo, if they can but ſay over the Creed by rote, and a few Words more, (that would fill the Church with Enemies of Chriſt;) and yet when Men are in, deny them Communion, unleſs they will ſtrictly come up to many humane unneceſſary Impoſitions; as if far ſtricter Obedience to Men (perhaps in Uſurpations) was neceſſary, than to Jeſus Chriſt? (*Way of Concord*, p. 118. §. 10.)

Q. 38. Whether the univerſal Church had not Unity long upon the Terms of Baptiſm and the Creed and Scriptures, without any other Subſcriptions, Oaths, or other Profeſſions made neceſſary to Communion? And whether it ever had Union upon ſuch additional Terms of new Profeſſions, Subſcriptions and Oaths, as moſt Churches now impoſe and require? Whether they departed not from Unity and Concord (and ſo continue divided to this day) when they departed from the antient Simplicity, and the primitive Terms? (*ibid.* p. 157. §. 42.) And whether thoſe Paſtors who will make Canons, that all *Engliſh* Proteſtants ſhall agree in Subſcriptions, Profeſſions, Oaths, Forms and Ceremonies which they

they are not agreed in, nor ever will be; do not in effect say, we will break them more in pieces, and set them farther from each other than before? (*ibid.* p. 183. §. 100.) Whether the hereticating and cursing Men for doubtful Words, or want of Skill in aptness of Expressions, yea, or for Errors which consist with having Faith in Christ, be not so far from being a means of the Churches Good, that it hath been the grand Engine of Satan, to exercise Tyranny, excite Hatred and Schism, &c. and therefore carefully to be avoided? (*Way of Concord* p. 195. §. 34.) whether anathematizing Men for doubtful Actions, or for such Faults as consist with true Christianity and continued Subjection to Jesus Christ, be not a sinful Church-dividing Means? (*ibid.* p. 195, 196.)

Q. 39. Whether Addition to Christ's Terms be not very perilous, as well as Diminution; as, when Men will deny Church-entrance, or Communion to any that Christ would have received, because they come not up to certain Terms, which they, or such as they, devise? And though they think, that Christ giveth them Power to do thus; yet whether their Error will make them guiltless? Or whether imputing their Error to Christ untruly, be not an Aggravation of the Sin? (*ibid.* p. 119. §. 1.) Whether it is a small Fault to usurp a Power proper to Christ? (*ibid.* §. 2.) Whether it be not dangerous Pride to think themselves great enough, wise enough, and good enough, to come after Christ, and to amend his Work? (*ibid.* §. 3.) And whether this imply not an Accusation against him, and his Institutions? (*ibid.* §. 4.) And whether the merciful Lord and Saviour of the Church, that came to take off heavy Burthens and intolerable Yokes, will take it well to have Men come after him, and as by his Authority, to make his easy Yoke more strait, and his light Burthen heavy, and to cast or keep out those that he hath redeemed and doth receive, and to deal cruelly with those that he hath so dearly bought, and so tenderly loveth? (*ibid.* p. 120. §. 6.) When Christ says, *Mat.* 18. 6. *Whoso shall offend one of these little Ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a Millstone were hanged about his Neck*, &c. Whether Bishops may curse such from Christ, and excommunicate them? (and whether it be safe for them to do so?) (*ibid.* p. 144.) And seeing that spiritual Priviledges excell temporal, whether it be not an aggravated Tyranny to deprive Christ's Servants of Benefits so precious, and so dearly bought? (*ibid.* p. 120 §. 9.)

Q. 40. Whether Christ be not the Institutor of the Church, and hath not himself made Laws which are sufficient to be at least the Bond of their Unity; yea, for more than Essentials, even the Integrals, and many Accidents? and hath not he given Laws to regulate all Men's Laws that determine of needful undetermined Accidents? And whether any Man should be cut off from the Church, or taken as separated, that breaketh no

Law

Law of God, neceſſary to Church-Unity and Communion? And whether the grand Schiſmaticks of the World are not the Engineers that fabricate needleſs, impoſſible, dividing Terms and Conditions of Unity and Communion? (*Anſw. to Dr. Sill. Serm.* p. 88, or 82.)

Q. 41. Whether it be not enough, that we are united and agreed with thoſe that differ from us, in more than Circumſtances: and that we will hold Concord with all in Faith, Love, and Communion; (if they will admit us without our ſinning) upon the Terms ſet down by the Holy Ghoſt and the Apoſtles, *Acts* 15. 28? And if no Men muſt be of the ſame Church or Kingdom, that have any difference; yea, as great as can reaſonably be ſuppoſed in the meer Non-conformiſts, whether any two Men can be of the ſame Church, or Kingdom, except you will compoſe it of ſuch as hold nothing unlawful, and conſequently nothing morally good, which is no Church? [*Judgment of Non-conformiſts in ſecond Plea for Peace*, p. 85, 86.]

Q. 42. Whether the long and ſad Experience of all the Chriſtian Churches, which have been divided by unneceſſary human Impoſitions, and the Voice of all wiſe Peace-makers in all times, who have ſtill called for [*Unity in things neceſſary, Liberty in things unneceſſary, and Charity in both*] do not leave thoſe that yet will not be perſwaded to theſe Terms, as inexcuſable Perſons as almoſt any in the World; worſe than thoſe Phyſicians, that would uſe all thoſe things as the only Remedies, which have killed all that ever took them? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 155. § 34.]

Q. 43. Whether they that confeſs, that for the Communion of all the Churches, there are no Terms like theſe now mentioned, ſhould be more cruel to their own at home, turning them out of their Father's Houſe for every Ceremonial Difference? Whether a Paſtor ſhould not love his own Flock, as well as the People of a Forreign Land? [*Ib.* p. 155, 156. § 35.] And whether it be not a Schiſmatical Opinion, that tho Churches of many Kingdoms may charitably differ in Ceremonies and indifferent things; yet none in the ſame Kingdom ſhould be ſuffered ſo to differ? Whether the Apoſtle *Paul* gave not the Paſtors and People of the ſame Church of *Rome* thoſe Precepts of forbearing and receiving Diſſenters in things indifferent? [*Way of Concord third Part*, p. 106.]

Q. 44. Whether Uniformity in Circumſtantials, and in External Polity, be any more than a Carkaſs or Image of Unity, without uniting Love (which is its Soul?) Whether all Union in Evil, or in unneceſſary Circumſtantials, which is managed to the diminution of Chriſtian Love, are any more to the Church, than as the Glory of adorned Cloathing, or Monuments, or Pictures to a Carkaſs? [*Ib.* p. 66.]



Q. 45.

Q. 45. Whether Love and Unity (which the moſt zealous for humane Impoſitions cannot but commend) would teach Men to tyrannize over Inferiors, to contrive the treading down of others that they may riſe, and to keep them down to ſecure their own Domination; to oppreſs the Poor, Weak, or Innocent, to make Snares for other Mens Conſciences, or to lay Stumbling-blocks before them, to occaſion them to Sin, or to drive them on to ſin againſt Conſcience, and ſo to Hell, to ſhew Mens Authority (about things they call indifferent, or) in a thing of nought? [*Way of Concord*, p. 36.] Would not true Love end our greateſt Differences, if Men loved their Neighbours without diſſembling, as themſelves; and did but as they would be done by? [*Second Plea for Peace*, p. 156. § 37.] Yea, if many of the Children of the Church were injudiciouſly ſcrupulous, when fear of Sin and Hell was the Cauſe, whether a tender Paſtor would not abate them a Ceremony in ſuch a caſe, when his abating it hath no ſuch danger? [*Ib.* § 38.]

Q. 46. Whether Unmerciful Paſtors do not tempt the People to queſtion, whether they be ſent of God? Whether the People will not judg of Paſtors, as *Solomon* of the true Mother of the Child; that the Merciful and Loving is the true Paſtor, and the Hurtful is the Uſurper? [*Ib.* p. 156, 157. § 39.]

Q. 47. Whether they that can bear with ſuch as underſtand not the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity, and with Drunkards, Swearers, Fornicators, *&c.* in their conſtant Congregations and Communion; and yet will not bear with an honeſt godly Chriſtian, that differeth from their way of Worſhip in no greater matter than a Ceremony, have not ſomething more amiſs within than a Ceremony? [*Ib.* p. 162. § 48.] And whether the Souls of ſuch, as ſome call humorous, peeviſh, or wilful, be not worth more than ſome of that they call their Liberty? worth more than a needleſs Ceremony? [*Judgment of Non-conformiſts in ſecond Plea*, p. 66. q. 5.]

Q. 48. Whether as every Hypocrite would be very Religious, ſo far as he can ſubject the true common Religion to his own Intereſt and Luſts; ſo every Enemy of Peace will not ſeem zealous for Peace, ſo that his own Peace be made the Rule of the common Peace, that all Men be brought to center in his Intereſts, and take their Peace on his Terms, from him? [*Second Plea, &c.* p. 149.]

Q. 49. Whether all the Arguments for Unity and Peace, which are made uſe of againſt Toleration by Prelatiſts, and all the miſchiefs of diviſion which they aggravate, do not principally fall on themſelves, if it proves that they are the greateſt cauſes of Diviſion, and hinderers of Church-Concord? [*Ib.* p. 180. § 88.] Whether they do not condemn themſelves, who cry down Schiſm, while they unavoidably cauſe it? And whether overdoing

Terms

698

Terms of Church-Union and Concord be not the certainest Engines of Schism? [*Way of Concord*, p. 121. § 12.] Is it not a shameful thing to hear and read Mens tragical out-crys against necessary Toleration (which Christianity and Humanity plead for) while they are the causes of that which they exclaim against? If diversity in Religion be such an Evil, whether should Men cause it by their unnecessary Laws and Canons, and making Engines to tear the Church in pieces, which by the antient Simplicity, and commanded mutual Forbearance, would live in such a measure of Love and Peace, as may be here expected? [*Ib.* p. 272.]

Q. 50. Tho it be a Sin not to joyn with a less worthy Minister, and a less orderly Mode of Worship, when we can have no better; yet whether is it not also a Sin to tye our selves ordinarily to such, when we may have better lawfully, that is, *consideratis considerandis*, upon terms whereon it will not do more hurt than good? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 76.]

Q. 51. Tho it be granted, that such are justly condemned by God, that repent not, tho they had but a Reader: And that they should be thankful for so much in such Churches where they can have no better; yet whether is it in the power of any Man justly to forbid them better, when God provideth it? And whether must they obey such a prohibition, as such? (Tho Prudence may discern forbearance to be a Duty, when the hurt would be greater than the good.) [*First Plea for Peace*, p. 85.]

Q. 52. Whether Parish-Bounds of Churches be of Divine Institution, and unchangeable, or only of human prudential Constitution? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 10.] Can any Proof be produced, that ever God determined, the Churches should necessarily be individuated by Parish-Bounds or Limits of Ground; and that Men in the same Limits might not have divers Bishops, and be of divers particular Churches? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 13.] Whether is such a distribution of Parishes, a thing of absolute necessity to a Church, or only as the general Rules of Order and Edification do ordinarily in Christian Kingdoms require it? And whether can we be bound to such humane distribution against any of Christ's own Laws and Predeterminations; or when any changes turn them against the good Ends for which they are made? Whether can humane Church-Laws bind to Obedience, when they are notoriously against the Laws of Christ, or against the Common Good, or are made by Usurpation without Authority thereto? [*ibid.* p. 31, 32.]

Q. 53. Whether are the Bishops that dwell in *London*-Parishes (or others) Members of the Parish-Church where they dwell? If not, whether dwelling in the Parish makes a Christian a Member of the Parish-Church? If not, what makes a Member, and how are the Pastors special Flock truly known to him from others? If the Bishops be Members, Doth

699



the Canon that forbids Men to go from their own Parish-Churches, extend to the Bishop? And to whom shall we present the Bishop for not coming to Church, or for his Crimes? What? to himself? [*Defence of the Plea for Peace*, p. 110, 111.]

Q. 54. Whether a Ministry be not ordinarily necessary to the propagating of the Gospel, and the saving of Souls? (See *Rom.* 10. 14, 15.) [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 9.] If Men can spare the Ministry, why are they maintained? If they are needful for the safety of Mens Souls, must so many thousands hazard their Souls, for want of needful help? [*Answ. to Dr.* Stil. *Serm.* p. 52. or 54.] And whether is there not need of a far greater number of Assistants, than all the present Non-conformists? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 10.] And what harm is there in the Non-conformists preaching, where the tenth Person cannot come to Church, if they would? [*Sacril. Desert.* p. 12.] And what may we think of such, as had rather 10000 Persons stayed idly at home, or went to Sports or Drinking, in *Stepny*-Parish, or *Giles Cripplegate*, or *Sepulchers*, or *Martins in the Fields*, &c. than that any Non-conformists should preach to them? (See 1 *Thess.* 2. 15, 16.) [*ib.* p. 13.] When in *London* it is conjectured that not above the 7*th* or 8*th* part of the Inhabitants can come to hear in the outer Parishes, and if the other 6 or 7 parts should seek for room in the emptier Churches within the Walls, it cannot be supposed that above one part of those 6 or 7 would find room: and so if all be set together, it may be supposed that there is place but for about the 5*th* or 4*th* part at most of all the People in all the Parish-Churches within and without the Walls: and *London* is to be denominated rather from three, four, or five parts than from one of these: and the great Parishes, where one of twenty cannot hear, are far off from the Churches that have room, and those that have most need, have least desire of the Means; *Quere*, Whether the famousest and happiest City for Religion in the World should thus be left to turn Infidels, Pagans, Atheists, or be kept from all publick Worship of God? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 230.] And whether most great Parishes (especially in Cities and great Towns) have not more Souls which call for ministerial help, than Conformists and Non-conformists, if they lovingly joined, are well able to afford necessary help to? [*ib.* p. 229.]

Q. 55. Whether many in place are not grosly defective in the necessary Qualifications for their Office, (and consequently in the discharge of the same?) [*Sacriledg. Desert.* p. 10.] And can any Man prove, that if the Parish-Minister cannot, or will not baptize his Children, he must not get another to do it, yea, a prohibited Minister, rather than they should be unbaptized; and yet that if the Parish-Church cannot receive him, or the Pastor cannot, or will not do the Office of a Pastor for him, he must be without

Preach-

Preaching, Worſhipping God, and Paſtoral overſight? [*Firſt Plea, &c.* p. 103.] And when the Biſhops hold it a Duty to avoid a Non-conformiſt that hath not their Licenſe; is there not as much to be ſaid for avoiding a wicked Prieſt, who (it is ſure) hath not Chriſt's Licenſe, and is a Non-conformiſt to his Laws? [*Ib.* p. 111.] When Pope *Nicholas* and ſome of the Popiſh Councils forbad all Men to hear Maſs from a fornicating Prieſt, Whether ſhould not Proteſtants be as ſtrict? And whether is it not as lawful to depart from the Pariſh-Prieſt for being a Drunkard, a Scorner at Godlineſs, a Perſecutor, an inſufficient Guide of Souls, as for being a Fornicator? And whether many Councils do not forbid hearing Hereticks? [*Way of Concord, third Part*, p. 8. §. 20.]

Q. 56. Whether this Argument be not good, our neceſſity requireth Paſtoral overſight, and Chriſt commandeth us to uſe it, when we may have it: But from this publick Miniſter we cannot have it: Therefore we muſt ſeek it where we can? [*Firſt Plea, &c.* p. 100.] And whether People are not deprived of Paſtoral overſight as from the allowed Miniſter, 1. When publick Paſtors are at ſo great a diſtance from them, as that ſuch Paſtors cannot come to them, nor they and their Families go ſo far, without ſuch coſt and pains and loſs of time as will deprive them of the Benefit. 2. When Pariſhes are ſo great that the allowed Paſtors cannot preach to half, or a fourth, or tenth part, and cannot viſit half the ſick, *&c.* 3. Where the allowed Paſtors are ſo ſlothful or proud, that they will not condeſcend to ſuch Offices of perſonal Help as the People have need of, eſpecially to the poorer ſort. 4. Where they are young, raw, or ignorant, unable to counſel People, as their neceſſities require in order to their Salvation. 5. Where they are ſo profane and malignant, that if poor People come to them with Caſes of Conſcience, or for Counſel what they muſt do to be Saved, they will but deride them, and would make them believe that to be ſollicitous about Salvation, and afraid of Sinning, and ſeriouſly Godly, is but to be Hypocrites, Melancholly or Mad. 6. Where they are Heretical, and not to be truſted in point of Faith? When in any of theſe Caſes the People, or part of them are deprived of that Paſtoral Help, which their neceſſity requireth, and God commandeth, whether may they not ſeek it where they can beſt have it? [*Ib.* p. 100, 101, 102.] Whether many Souls are not like to be fed, or famiſhed, and conſequently to live or die, as Non-conformiſts do their Duty, or neglect it? [*Sacril. Deſert.* p. 84.] And whether if the poor were famiſhing about us, any Law of Mans can diſoblige us from relieving them? [*Ib.* p. 85.]

Q. 57. If they that are vowed to the Miniſtry, are bound to exerciſe the Miniſtry (and otherwiſe would be ſacrilegious and cruel to Souls) can they preach without Auditors? And can thoſe Auditors be no Congregation? [*Ib.* p. 70.]

Q. 58.

Q. 58. Where both the ejected and impoſed Miniſter are fit Perſons, whether may not the People take them both conjunctly for their Paſtors, each adminiſtring to the ſame Church according to their various Liberties and Capacities? [*ib.* p. 11.]

Q. 59. If Conformiſts generally would ſet themſelves to preach and pray in a ſound and ſerious, holy manner, and encourage and promote Piety in the People, and willingly accept of all the Help they could get here; if they endeavoured to do God and his Church more Service than thoſe that went before them, whether they would not be more honoured, at leaſt by the better ſort (and that deſervedly) than ever they muſt look to be for Rigidneſs about Ceremonies, *&c.* Whether Godlineſs be not that which godly People moſt care for? [*ibid.* p. 126.]

Q. 60. Whether would they have People taught, reformed, ſaved, or not? If yea, would they not have neceſſary help to do it? (If not; are ſuch fit to be Miniſters of Chriſt?) And does that Man truly know what it is to be a Miniſter, or a Chriſtian, that perceives not a neceſſity of Help, if he can have it? (*ibid* p. 129.) And if things in *England* were once brought to that paſs, that really our Labour would be unneceſſary in the Judgment of thoſe that are not Infidels, Ignorants or malignant Enemies of an holy Life, whether need any fear coming to loſs, if they were bound for us, that we would preſently gratify all, that deſire our Silence, or Baniſhment, rather than trouble Men with needleſs Work? [*ib.* p. 134.]

Q. 61. Whether is it the Paucity of ignorant and ungodly Souls, or the great Number, Ability, Zeal, and Diligence of the Conformiſts, that makes the Labours of others needleſs? Or what are their Thoughts of Souls, of Sin, of Repentance, of Holineſs, and of their own Sufficiency and Labours? [*Ib.* p. 57.] As of old every ſingle Church had uſually many Presbyters and Deacons with the Biſhop; ſo is it not undeniable, that many of our Pariſhes have Work enough for many Miniſters? And whether the only thing pretended for our preſent Paucity be not the want of Maintenance (with the want of worthy Men?) [*First Plea &c. p.* 227.]

Q. 62. Whether then might it not have been expected of ſuch as needed and deſired the help of their Brethren, that long ere this they ſhould have petitioned Rulers for the Liberty of their Miniſtry (when all knew that there was no Hope their own petitioning ſhould have Succeſs?) Whether might they not have humbly acquainted our Rulers, That all our Labours conjoyned are too little; that they needed our Help, and the ignorant our Teaching; that their Judgment was, our Miniſtry is more neceſſary than our perſonal Conformity? And whether ſhould not Miniſters of all Men have been moſt ſenſible of the Churches Breaches, Loſs and

Danger,

Danger, and moſt compaſſionate over Peoples Souls? [*Sacril. Deſert.* p. 135.] And whether had they not healed all our Breaches, if they had petioned, and prevailed but for theſe two things, *viz.* 1. That the door of Entrance might not have been barred by any other Subſcriptions, Profeſſions or Oaths, than what were uſed in the Churches of Chriſt, till the Exaltation of the Papacy (for 600 Years) beſides the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and the ſubſcribing the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in the 39 Articles, according to the 13th of Queen *Elizabeth*. 2. That thoſe (ſo ſubſcribing) who dare not uſe the Liturgy and Ceremonies, might have leave to preach in the Churches which uſe them, under Laws which ſhall reſtrain them from all unpeaceable Oppoſition to what they dare not uſe, or to the Government of the Church? [*ibid.* p. 136, 137.] And what but a ſpirit of Envy, or a carnal Intereſt, croſs to the Intereſt of Chriſt and Mens Salvation, ſhould grudge at their Preaching, while they are reſponſible for all they ſay, or do amiſs? [*Firſt Plea*, &c. p. 249.]

*Q.* 63. Whether the Accuſers of the *Non-conformiſts*, who feign ſtrange things of them relating to Doctrine and Government (which they do not own) do not, 1. Hereby render them contemptible and odious, as brain-ſick Perſons, who keep up a dividing Faction, in ſpight of the Light and Obligation of the common Principles of Humanity and Society? 2. And do they not hereby imprint the Stamp of Satan, *viz.* the hatred of their Brethren on the minds of ſuch Hearers as will believe them, and receive the Impreſs? 3. And do they not hereby fill Families, Cities and Countries with all that Spawn of ugly Sins, which are the Genuine Fruits of ſuch Hatred and Contempt; and keep Men alſo from Repentance for any thing that they have ſaid or done (how cruelly ſoever) againſt ſuch Miniſters and others, that are repreſented as ſo odious to them? 4. And do they not hereby fortify the Peoples Souls againſt receiving converting, or edifying Inſtruction by ſuch accuſed Miniſters? 5. And do they not thus furniſh Papiſts, Infidels, and other Adverſaries with matter of Accuſation againſt one part of the Miniſters and Servants of Chriſt *&c.* [*Judgment of Non-conformiſts in Second Plea for Peace.* p. 21, 22.] And whether is it not diabolical, for any to be angry, if (as we have Opportunity) we ſo far undeceive the People, as to acquaint them with our Judgment, and the Untruth of what they have believed of us? [*ibid.* p. 85.] And whether we may not ſuppoſe, that Satan is afraid of their Miniſtry who hath ſtirred up ſo much Oppoſition againſt it? [*Sacril. Deſert.* p. 84.]

*Q.* 64. Whether Popery will come in ever the more for *Non-conformiſt*'s Preaching? (Whether ſuch will preach for, or againſt it?) Or ever the leſs, if they renounce their Miniſtry? [*ibid.* p. 82.] Whether they that

cry

cry out of the danger of Popery, Infidelity, Prophaneſs and Hereſies; and yet had rather let them all in, then give us leave to exerciſe that Miniſtry to which we were conſecrated, in Poverty and Subjection; and while they cry out of Diviſions, will not lay by the dividing Engines; ſhould rather accuſe us, or themſelves, if the Evils overwhelm us, which they ſeem to fear? [*ibid.* p. 137, 138.]

Q. 65. When any are unjuſtly caſt out of their Pariſh-Churches, whether all Miniſters are thereupon obliged, or allowed to deſert, or neglect them? [*ib.* p. 21.]

Q. 66. If a Patient would not take a Medicine from one Mans hand, whether would not the Phyſician conſent that another ſhould give it him? Whether would the Father let the Infant famiſh, if it would take Food from none but its Mother? And whether would there be need of the beſt Conformiſts, as Miniſters, if the People had no Faults, or Weakneſſes? [*ibid.* p. 125, 126.] What if they culpably would hear no other? Is it better to let them hear none at all, than that we preach to them? [*Anſw. to Dr.* Stil. *Serm.* p. 59. *or* 61.]

Q. 67. Whether it be not one thing to deny total Communion with a Church, and another to ſeparate but *ſecundum quid*, for ſome Act, or Part? Whether it be not one thing to ſeparate locally by bodily Abſence, and another mentally by Schiſmatical Principles? Whether it be not one thing to depart wilfully, and another to be unwillingly caſt out? Whether it be not one thing to depart raſhly and in haſt, and another to depart after due Patience, when Reformation appears hopeleſs [*Firſt Plea*, &c. p. 38, 39.]

Q. 68. When the publick Good requires *Non-conformiſts* to hold diſtinct Aſſemblies, for Aſſiſtance in Doctrine, Worſhip, and Diſcipline, as near as they can according to the Will of God, to further, not to diſgrace or hinder the honeſt Pariſh-miniſters, whether are theſe ſeparate Churches, any more than Chappels be? Or diſtinct Churches, more than *ſecundum quid*, holding perſonal Communion in a godly Converſation with the reſt of the Chriſtians in the Pariſh, and alſo ſometimes aſſembling with them? [*Sacril. Deſert.* p. 22, 23.] Or whether thoſe that do their beſt to keep up the Reputation of the publick conformable Miniſtry, to further Love and Concord, and the ſucceſs of their Labours with the People; and profeſs to take their own Aſſemblies but as Chappels, and not as diſtinct, much leſs as ſeparated Churches; yea, and thoſe who do adminiſter Sacraments, and do that which is like the Separatiſt's Way; yet do it not on their Principles, but *pro tempore*, till God ſhall give them Opportunity to ſerve him in the eſtabliſhed Way (it being reformed, or well-ordered Pariſh-Churches, under the Government and Countenance of the Chriſtian

Christian Magistrates, which are most agreeable to their Desires) whether such (I say) are justly accounted Separatists? [*First Plea &c.* p. 246.]

Q. 69. Whether we may not set up other Churches, when we are necessarily kept from those established by publick Power? [*Ib.* p. 77.]

Q. 70. Whether it be Schism to preach, and gather Churches, and elect and ordain Pastors, and assemble for God's Worship against the Laws and Will of Heathen, Mahometan, or Infidel Princes that forbid it; as the Christians did for 300 Years? And if there be the same Cause and Need, whether it be any more Schism to do it against the Laws and Will of a Christian Prince? For, 1. Are not Christ's Laws equally obligatory? 2. Are not Souls equally precious? 3. Is not the Gospel and God's Worship equally necessary? 4. And doth his Christianity enable him to do more Hurt than a Pagan may do, or more Good? [*Ibid.* p. 51, 52.]

Q. 71. If Competent Pastors be set over half the Parishes in a Kingdom, and the other half hath incompetent Men; or if nine Parts of a Kingdom were competently supplied, and but the tenth Part had not such set over them, to whom the People may lawfully commit the Pastoral Care of their Souls, whether is it Schism, or whether is it not a Duty for those that are destitute, to get the best Supply they can? And whether is it Schism, or whether is it not a Duty for faithful Ministers, though forbidden by Superiours, to perform their Office to such People that desire it? [*Ibid.* p. 83.] If the Magistrate appoint 20000, or 10000, or one half of a Parish to be excluded for want of Room, and Teachers, is it not ill supposed that the Gospel is truly and sufficiently preached to them, to whom it is not preached at all? Or doth it prove it not necessary to them, that it is preached to others? [*Answ. to Dr.* Stil. *Serm.* p. 22.] And whether is not the general Ordination of Ministers with the Peoples Necessity and Consent, added to God's general Commands to all his Ministers, to be faithful and diligent, a sufficient obliging Call to such Ministration, without the Will of (prohibiting) Superiours, yea, against it? And otherwise doth it not follow, that it is at the Will of a Man, whether Souls shall be saved or damned? (for how shall they believe, unless they hear? And how shall they hear without a Preacher?) and at the Will of Man, whether Christ shall have a Church, and God be publickly worshipped, or not? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 48.] And whether doth not the indispensible Law of Nature oblige every Man according to his Place and Calling, his Ability, and Opportunities, to do his best to propagate Christ's Gospel, and to save Mens Souls, as much and more than to feed Mens Bodies and save their Lives? And whether are not Ministers specially obliged to do it (by their Calling) as Ministers of Christ, thereto devoted? [*Ibid.* p.

Q. 72. There being ſo many ſorts of Churches in the World, (as Univerſal, National, Patriarchal, Provincial, or Metropolitical, Dioceſan, Claſſical, Parochial, Congregational) whether muſt it not be hard to give a juſt Deciſion of the Queſtion, [From which of theſe, and when it is a Sin to ſeparate?] till it be firſt known, which of theſe is of Divine, and which of Humane Inſtitution? and which Humane Churches are neceſſary, which Lawful, and which Sinful? (*ibid.* p. 7.) How is it proved, and how cometh it to be any great matter to ſeparate from a Church-Form which God never made? [*Anſw. to Dr.* Still. *Serm.* p 33.]

Q. 73. Whether they that ſay thoſe Species (National, Patriarchal, Provincial, Dioceſan) are of God, muſt not prove that God inſtituted them in Scripture; or elſe that he gave ſome Men power to inſtitute them ſince Scripture-times? And till the ſame be proved, whether are any bound to obey them, at leaſt when they over-rule Chriſt's own Inſtitutions? (*Way of Concord, p.* 111. §. 15.) And whether to deviſe new Species of Churches without God's Authority, and impoſe them on the World (in his Name) and call all Diſſenters Schiſmaticks, be not a far worſe Uſurpation, than to make and impoſe new Ceremonies, or Liturgies? (*ibid.* §. 16.)

Q. 74. Whether a Society of Neighbour-Chriſtians aſſociated with a Paſtor, or Paſtors, for perſonal Communion in holy Doctrine, Diſcipline, and Worſhip, be not a Church Form of Divine Inſtitution? (*Firſt Plea*, &c. p. 8.) And whether any Proof hath ever been produced, that many Churches of this firſt Rank, muſt (of Duty) make one fixed, greater, compound Church by Aſſociation, as Dioceſan, National, *&c.* and that God hath inſtituted any ſuch Form? Whether the greateſt Defenders of Prelacy do not affirm ſuch to be but humane Inſtitutions? (*ib.* p. 12, 13.) Whether ever any ſatisfactory Proof hath been brought, that ever Chriſt or his Apoſtles did inſtitute any particular Church (taken in a political Senſe, as organized, and not meerly for a Community) without a Biſhop, or Paſtor, who had the Power of teaching them, ruling them by the Word, and Power of the Church-keys, and leading them in publick Worſhip? (*ibid.* p. 13.) And whether hath it yet been proved, that any one Church of this firſt Rank (which was not an Aſſociation of Churches) conſiſted in Scripture-times of many (much leſs of many ſcores or hundreds) ſuch fixed Churches, or Congregations? Or that any one Biſhop of the firſt Rank (that was not an Apoſtle, or Biſhop of Biſhops) had more than one of ſuch fixed Societies, or Churches under him; or might have more ſtated Members of his Church than were capable of perſonal Communion, and mutual Aſſiſtance at due Seaſons, in holy Doctrine, Diſcipline, and Worſhip? As now there are many Chappels in ſome Pariſhes, whoſe

Proximity

Proximity and Relation to the Pariſh-Churches make them capable of perſonal Communion in due ſeaſons with the whole Pariſh (at leaſt *per vices*) in thoſe Churches, and in their Converſation; and as a ſingle Congregation may prudently, in Perſecution, or foul Weather, meet oft-times in ſeveral Houſes; ſo why might not the great Church of *Jeruſalem* (which yet cannot be proved a quarter ſo big as ſome of our Pariſhes) hold their publick Meetings oft at the ſame time in divers Houſes, when they had no Temples, and yet be capable of perſonal Communion, as before deſcribed? [*ibid.* p. 13, 14.]. And when the learned Dr. *Hammond* on 1 *Tim.* 3. ſaith, The Church of the Living God, was every ſuch regular Aſſembly of Chriſtians under a Biſhop (ſuch as *Timothy* was) an *Oeconomus* ſet over them by Chriſt, *&c.* doth he not here ſuppoſe (as he elſewhere ſheweth) that *de facto*, Epiſcopal Churches were in Scripture-times but ſingle Congregations? Then whether is the new Form of Congregations *jure divino*, when they become but parts of a Biſhops Church? And may we not query the ſame of the new Form of a Dioceſan Church? (*ibid.* p. 5, 6.) And doth not *Ignatius* expreſly make *one Altar*, and *one Biſhop* with Presbyters and Deacons, to be the Note of a Churche's Unity and Individuation? (Whence learned Mr. *Joſeph Mede* doth argue it, as certain, that then a Biſhop's Church was no other than ſuch as uſually communicated in one place) (*ibid.* p. 17.) And ſee (*Anſw. to Dr.* Still. *Serm.* p. 75. or 69.)

Q. 75. And ſeeing it cannot be proved, that God hath inſtituted any other than Congregational, or Parochial Churches (as for preſent Communion) whether muſt it not follow, that none of the reſt inſtituted by Man, have Power to deprive ſuch ſingle Churches of any of the Priviledges granted them by Chriſt? And whereas Chriſt hath made the Terms of Catholick Communion himſelf, and hath commanded all ſuch to worſhip him publickly in holy Communion under faithful Paſtors, choſen, or at leaſt conſented to by themſelves (which was the Judgment of the Churches many hundred Years) whether can any humane Order or Power deprive them of any of this Benefit, or diſoblige them from any of this Duty, by juſt Authority? (*Way of Concord*, p. 111. §. 13.)

Q. 76. Then if any Prince would turn his Kingdom, or a whole Province into one only Church; and thereby overthrow all the firſt Order of Churches of Chriſt's Inſtitution, which are aſſociated for perſonal preſent Communion, allowing them no Paſtors that have the Power of the Keys, or all eſſential to their Office; though he ſhould allow Parochial Oratories, or Chappels, which ſhould be no true Churches, but parts of a Church; Whether were it Schiſm to gather Churches within ſuch a Church, againſt the Laws of ſuch a Prince? (*Firſt Plea*, &c. p. 52.) Or whether hath

God made such proper Judges, whether Christ should have Churches according to his Laws, or whether God should be worshipped, and Souls saved, or his own Institution of Churches be observed? (*Ibid.* p. 53.)

Q. 77. And if any Persons shall pretend to have the Power of governing the Churches, and Inferiour Pastors, as their Bishops, who are obtruded on those Churches, without the Election, or Consent of the People, or inferiour Pastors, and these Bishops shall by Laws, or Mandates forbid such Assembling, Preaching, or Worship as otherwise would be Lawful and a Duty; whether is it Schism to disobey such Laws, or Mandates, as such? (*ibid.* p. 80.) Bishop *Bilson* (of *Subject.* p. 399.) grants, [The Election of Bishops in those days belonged to the People, and not to the Prince; and though *Valens* by plain force placed *Lucius* there; yet might the People lawfully reject him, as no Bishop, and cleave to *Peter* their right Pastor.] (*ibid.* p. 79.) And however in some Cases the Advantages of some imposed Persons may make it an Act of Prudence, and so a Duty to consent; yet whether are such truly the Bishops of such Churches, till they do consent? (*ibid.* p. 80.) Hath not this been taken for their Right given them by God? And doth not Dr. *Blondel* (*de jure Plebis in Reg. Eccl.*) beyond Exception prove it, with more? (*ib.* p. 81.) Therefore if Bishops that have no Foundation of such Relative Power, shall impose inferiour Pastors on the Parish-Churches, and command the Peoples Acceptance and Obedience; whether are the People bound to accept and obey them by any Authority that is in that Command, as such? Or whether is it Schism to disobey it? (*ibid.* p. 82.)

Q. 78. Whether doth it not follow from the Principles of the Diocesan, that holdeth a Bishop is Essential to a Church, and consequently that we have no more Churches than Dioceses, That he who separateth from a Parish-Church, separates from no Church? (*Sacril. Desert.* p. 24.)

Q. 79. Whether we should not more justly deserve the term of Schismaticks, if we renounced Communion with all other Churches, except Parochial and Conformists? And whose Conscience should sooner accuse him of Schism? Whether ours, that resolve to hold Communion seasonably with all true Christian Churches among us, that teach not Heresy, nor preach down Holiness, &c. and deny us not their Communion, unless we will sin? or a Conformists, that will hold Communion with none but his own Party, but separates from all other Churches in the Land? [*Ib.* p. 41.] Is he a greater Separatist that confesseth them to be a true Church, and their Communion lawful; but preferreth another as fitter for him: or he that denieth Communion with true worshipping Assemblies, as unlawful to be communicated with, when it is not so? If the former, then will it not follow, that condemning them as no Church, is a Diminution, or no

Aggravation

Aggravation of Separation, and the local presence of an Infidel, or Scorner, would be a less separate state, than the absence of their Friends? If the latter (which is certain) then will it not follow, that if we can prove the Assemblies lawful which they condemn, they are the true Separatists that condemn them, and deny Communion with them, declaring it unlawful? [*Answ. to Dr.* Stil. *Serm.* p. 47, or 49.]

Q. 80. And whether is not the Separation of whole Churches much worse than of single Persons from one Church, when it is upon unwarrantable Cause, or Reasons? [*Ib.* p. 31.] (Now, how many of the Dissenters frequently communicate with them, while they generally refuse, shun, and condemn our Assemblies?) Are there no true Churches to be found in the World, that have no Bishops (of a superior order over Pastors?) And were there not true Churches in *England* in that long Interval of Episcopal Government? And are not they as justly to be charged with Schism, and Separation from those true Churches, which were before the re-establishment of Episcopacy, as they that are commonly charged by those Encroachers, and Invaders of other Mens Rights? [*Vid. Sacril. Deser.* p. 60.]

Q. 81. Seeing the Universal Church is certainly the highest Species, whether have any Authority, on pretence of narrower Communion in lower Churches, to change Christ's terms of Catholick Communion, or to deprive Christians of the right of being loved and received by each other, or to disoblige them from the duty of loving and receiving each other? Whether can humane Power made by their own Contracts, change Christ's Laws, or the Priviledges or Forms of Christ's own Churches? [*Way of Concord*, p. 111. §. 14.]

Q. 82. Whether the greatest and commonest Schism be not by dividing Laws and Canons, which causlesly silence Ministers, scatter Flocks, and decree the unjust Excommunication of Christians, and deny Communion to those that yield not to sinful, or unnecessary, ill-made Terms of Communion? [*ibid. third Part*, p. 13. §. 43.] And if any proud, passionate, or erroneous Person do, as *Diotrephes*, cast out the Brethren undeservedly, by unjust Suspensions, Silencings, or Excommunications, whether this be not tyrannical Schism? [*First Plea*, &c. p. 41.] And as we say of the Papists, that they unjustly call those Men Schismaticks, whom they first cast out themselves by unjust Excommunication; may we not say so of any others? especially if either for that which is a Duty, or for some small mistake, which is not in the Persons power to rectify, no greater than most good Christians are guilty of, their Church-Law says, he shall be excommunicate *ipso facto*? (*ibid.* p. 104.) See also [*Answ. to Dr.* Stil. *Serm.* p. 47. or 48. §. 8.]

Q. 83.

Q. 83. Whether making ſinful Terms of Communion, impoſing things forbidden by God on thoſe that will have Communion with them, and expelling thoſe that will not ſo ſin, whether this be not heinous Schiſm? [*First Plea, &c.* p. 41, 42.]

Q. 84. Whether all thoſe would not be deeply guilty of ſuch Schiſm, who by talk, writing or preaching juſtify and cry it up, and draw others into the Guilt, and reproach the Innocent as Schiſmaticks for not offending God? [*Ib.*]

Q. 85. If any will confine the Power or Exerciſe of the Church-Keys into ſo few Hands, as ſhall make the Exerciſe of Chriſt's Diſcipline impoſſible; or ſhall make Churches ſo great, or Paſtors ſo few, as that the moſt of the People muſt needs be without Paſtoral Overſight, Teaching and publick Worſhip, and then will forbid thoſe People to commit the care of their Souls to any other, that would be Paſtors indeed, and ſo would compel them to live without Chriſt's Ordinances, true Church-Communion, and Paſtoral Help, whether this would not be Schiſmatical, and much worſe? [*Ib.* p. 44.]

Q. 86. When able faithful Paſtors are lawfully ſet over the Aſſemblies, by juſt Election and Ordination, if any will cauſleſsly and without Right ſilence them, and command the People to deſert them, and to take to others (for their Paſtors) in their ſtead, of whom they have no ſuch knowledg, as may encourage them to ſuch a change; Whether this can be defended from the charge of Schiſm? (As *Cyprian* in the caſe of *Novatian* ſays, that he could be no Biſhop, becauſe another was rightful Biſhop before.) [*Ib.* p. 49, 50.]

Q. 87. Whether the way to heal us be not, 1. To approve the beſt, 2. To tolerate the tolerable, 3. To have Sacraments free, and not forced, 4. To reſtrain the Intolerable, 5. This to be the Teſt of Toleration, Whether ſuch tolerated Worſhip do more good or hurt, in true impartial Judgment, 6. Magiſtrates keeping all in Peace? [*Way of Concord, third Part*, p. 144.]

Q. 88. Whether it be not a weakning of the King's Intereſt, to divide his Subjects, and build up unneceſſary Walls of Partition between them, and to keep them in ſuch Diviſions; ſeeing a Kingdom divided againſt it ſelf cannot ſtand? And whether it be not unſafe and uncomfortable to a Prince to rule a divided mutinous People; but ſweet and ſafe to rule them that are united in mutual Love? Whether they that would lay the Peoples Concord upon uncapable Terms, would not bring the King's Intereſt in his Peoples Love, and willing Obedience, and ready Defence of him into too narrow a Bottom, making him the King of ſome cauſleſsly divided and eſpouſed

pouſed Party, which muſt be ſet up to the Oppreſſion of all the reſt, who are as wiſe and juſt, and loyal as they? [*Second Plea, &c.* p. 76. §. 24.]

*Si in neceſſariis ſit Unitas,*
*In Non-neceſſariis Libertas,*
*In utriſq; Charitas,*
*Optimo certe loco eſſent res noſtræ.*

To make a rounder number I may add, from Mr. *M. Godwyn* his [*Negro's and Indians Advocate*] pleading for the Inſtructing of them, and ſo admitting them into the Church (a Book lately Printed, and Dedicated to the Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*.)

*Q.* 89. Whether 'Is the wilful neglecting and oppoſing of it, (as he 'ſays in the Title-Page) no leſs than a manifeſt Apoſtacy from the Chriſti-'an Faith? Can no Chriſtian ever juſtify his omitting any poſſible lawful 'Means for the Advancement of his Religion? (as he ſays, *p.* 91.) Are all profeſſed Chriſtians abſolutely bound in their Places to endeavour the ſame, by their Vow in Baptiſm, and their very Profeſſion?

*Q.* 90. Then are they not bound in their Places to endeavour the Advancement of Religion, as well at home, as abroad? And do they not owe as much Service herein (for Chriſt's ſake) towards their own Countrymen, as towards Strangers? Should not *Engliſh-men* be as well concerned for *Engliſh-men*, as for *Indians*? And when the State of Religion is ſo viſibly declining in *England* (Atheiſm, Ignorance, Error, Profaneneſs, Popery and Superſtition encreaſing and getting up ſo faſt amongſt us) is he for any great Advancement of Religion, that would ſend away all Non-conformiſts (if there be thouſands of them) to his *Negro*'s and *Indians*, for this wiſe Reaſon, that 'There is no want of their Labours at home?

*FINIS.*

---

*ADVERTISEMENT.*

THe Reader is deſired to take notice that theſe Papers were ſent to *London*, by the Author, on the latter end of *February*, or beginning of *March* laſt, but by reaſon of the multitude of Pamphlets, they could not get through the Preſs ſooner.

The Ingenuous Reader is alſo deſired to paſs by the *Errata*, the Author being remote from the Preſs, theſe few he hath obſerved in ſome of the Sheets he hath ſeen, *viz.*

*ERRATA.*

PAge 5. l. 6. r. *above*. P. 20 l. 24. r. *do you not*. P. 21. l. 12. r. *Wages*. P. 22. l. 22. r. *Contrarywiſe*. P. 23. l. 24. r. *and*. P. 24. l. 18. dele, *down*. P. 28. l. 1. r. *Triarios*. P. 57. l. 6. r. *ſingle-ſoal'd*. P. 62 l. 29. r. *excite greater*. P. 63. l. 24. r. *Church*. P. 70. l. 30. r. *Inobſidentia*. P. 72. l. 19, 20. r. *betray*. P. 81. l. 35. r. *for*. P. 83. l. 36. r. *did he at all*.